DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 041 SO 019 246

AUTHOR	Rutkowski, Edward, Ed.
TITLE	Papers and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society (12th, Chicago, Illinois, October 29-30, 1976).
INSTITUTION	Midwest History of Education Society, Cedar Falls, IA.
PUB DATE	77
NOTE	159p.; For related documents, see SO 019 242-257.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society; v5 1977
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Black Colleges; *Black Education; Childrens Literature; *Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; Futures (of Society); *Ideology; Political Socialization; Protestants; Public Education; *Religious Education; Social Action; Social Agencies; Social History; Values Education
IDENTIFIERS	Counts (George S); Dewey (John)

ABSTRACT

The papers presented in this document cover three themes: (1) religious education; (2) the education of black U.S. citizens; and (3) the problem of education as imposition. Part 1 begins with "Tales for the Evangelical Nursery: Calculated to Edify, Caution, Instruct, Alarm, and Improve" (P. T. Rooke) that describes the moral instruction given in the nineteenth century home through the use of Mary Martha Sherwood's children's books. "Protestant Views on Education, 1865-1900: A Reevaluation of the Dual Pattern of Parallel Institutions Thesis" (R. Ognibene) argues that the Protestant denominations (Baptist, Episcopalian, and Presbyterian) had not expressed complete agreement with secular education. "The Philosophy of the Religious Education Association, 1903" (H. A. Archibald) discusses the relationship of John Dewey, George Albert Coe, and others to the Association and the debate over how to reconcile certain disciplines, such as psychology, with religious education. Part 2 begins with "Industrial Philanthropy and Black Higher Education, 1915-1930" (J. D. Anderson) and argues that industrial philanthropists' policy supported only those institutions like Fisk University that produced conservative black leaders. "In Pursuit of Freedom: The Educational Activities of Black Social Organization in Philadelphia, 1900-1930" (V. P. Franklin) describes the purposes and activities of black heritage societies, women's clubs, the YMCA and YWCA, schools, newspapers, and other organizations. Part 3 begins with "George S. Counts as an Ideologist of American Education: The 1930s" (G. L. Gutek) which discusses Counts's ideas about the 1930s, the U.S. past, social change, and programs to create a new society. "George S. Counts and the Imposition Controversy" (G. J. Dixon) provides an overview of the debate about the inclusion of Counts's ideas of social reconstruction in education and in what way schools should impose the social issues on children. "The Bode-Childs Imposition Controversy: The Critical Perspectives of the Participants" (J. DiGiambattista) presents the positions of both men in the use of experimental intelligence. "The

Theory and Practice of Theodore Brameld's 'Defensible Partiality': A Mid-Century 'Resolution' to the Imposition Controversy" (C. Kridel) delineates the difference between reconstructionism and defensible partiality and reviews the Floodwood (Minnesota) Project. "The Politics of Values" (P. L. Smith) examines progressive education and the viewpoint of imposition. The program, business meeting's minutes, and list of attendees are included. (DJC)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED298041

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JOURNAL OF THE MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

Volume 5, 1977

Contents include

papers by

Patricia T. Rooke
Richard Ognibene
Helen A. Archibald
James D. Anderson
Vincent P. Franklin

together with panel discussion papers by

Gerald L. Gutek
George Dixon
James DiGiambattista
Craig Kridel
P. L. Smith

also the program of the Twelfth Annual Meeting

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

EDWARD RUTKOWSKI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 019246

Published by
College of Education
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls

JOURNAL OF THE MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

Volume 5, 1977

Contents include

papers by

Patricia T. Rooke
Richard Ognibene
Helen A. Archibald
James D. Anderson
Vincent P. Franklin

together with panel
discussion papers by

Gerald L. Gutek
George Dixon
James DiGiambattista
Craig Kridel
P. L. Smith

also the program of the Twelfth
Annual Meeting

Published by
College of Education
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls

Distributed and Published for the Society by the

College of Education

University of Northern Iowa

Cedar Falls, Iowa

Copyright 1977 by the Midwest History

of Education Society

Edited by

Edward Rutkowski, University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Any subscription or inquiries should be sent to the
Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society
Education Center, Room 513
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

This 1976 fall meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society was an exciting and fruitful experience for those who came. The attendance at the meeting was the largest in recent years with many new faces which are always welcome. The scholarly papers were excellent, well-presented, numerous, and substantial. An emerging characteristic of these meetings is that many participants are coming from longer distances to take part in this fall activity of the society. Our group is attracting more than regional attention. For example, at this year's meeting we had participants from Canada and the East Coast. This is evidence of the extension and interest in the Midwest History of Education Society.

The program was so well-conceived and planned by E. Edward McCellan with such an expansive format that this issue of the journal will publish only the papers of this meeting. There are ten papers, five which are very lengthly and voluminously footnoted, the other five are shorter in length, but all are very thought provocating for anyone who is interested in fundamental educational questions. For this reason and for the purposes of publication the papers are divided under three main headings; religious education, education of Black Americans, and a series of shorter essays which served as the basis of a panel discussion on the problem of education as imposition, as reflected in the debates of prominent educators of the 1930's.

As in all previous editions of the journal, no edition would be complete without recognition and thanks being extended to our hosts at Loyola University, Chicago. For over a decade we have met at their downtown campus and have been treated wonderfully. We as a society are very grateful for their hard work. The attendance, interest, and stature that the society has received and continues to enjoy are positive outcomes of their efforts on our behalf. The editor wishes to thank his own institution for their continued support of our humble efforts. More importantly, the editor wishes to acknowledge the staff of the College of Education, the secretarial and graphics personnel of the University of Northern Iowa. Without their help and assistance this publication would not exist.

Edward Rutkowski
Editor

CONTENTS

PART I
MORAL AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

"TALES OF THE EVANGELICAL NURSERY—CALCULATED TO EDIFY, CAUTION, INSTRUCT, ALARM AND IMPROVE"
by Patricia T. Rooke, University of Alberta 1

"PROTESTANT VIEWS ON EDUCATION, 1865-1900: A REEVALUATION OF THE DUAL PATTERN OF PARALLEL INSTITUTIONS THESIS"
by Richard Ognibene, Siena College 20

"THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, 1903"
by Helen A. Archibald, Emory and Henry College 45

PART II
NEW PERSPECTIVES ON THE EDUCATIONAL HISTORY OF BLACK AMERICANS

"INDUSTRIAL PHILANTHROPY AND BLACK HIGHER EDUCATION 1915-1930"
by James D. Anderson, University of Illinois 65

"IN PURSUIT OF FREEDOM: THE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS IN PHILADELPHIA, 1900-1930"
by Vincent P. Franklin, University of Illinois 81

PART III
RECONSTRUCTIONISM AND THE IMPOSITION CONTROVERSY OF THE 1930's AND 1940's

"GEORGE S. COUNTS AS AN IDEOLOGIST OF AMERICAN EDUCATION, THE 1930's"
by Gerald L. Gutek, Loyola University of Chicago 99

"GEORGE S. COUNTS AND THE IMPOSITION CONTROVERSY"
by George J. Dixon, Ohio State University 105

"THE BODE-CHILDS IMPOSITION CONTROVERSY: THE CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES OF THE PARTICIPANTS"
by James DiGiambattista, Ohio State University 112

"THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THEODORE BRAMELD'S 'DEFENSIBLE PARTIALITY': A MID-CENTURY "RESOLUTION" TO THE IMPOSITION CONTROVERSY"
by Craig Kridel, Ohio State University 120

"THE POLITICS OF VALUES"
by P. L. Smith, Ohio State University 135

PART IV
PROCEEDINGS

OFFICIAL PROGRAM 149

BUSINESS MEETING AND THE ELECTION OF NEW OFFICERS 152

DIRECTORY OF ATTENDANCE 153

PART I
MORAL AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

TALES FOR THE EVANGELICAL NURSERY-- CALCULATED TO EDIFY, CAUTION, INSTRUCT, ALARM AND IMPROVE

by

Patricia T. Rooke
The University of Alberta

> All children are by nature evil; and while they have none but the natural evil principle to guide them, pious and prudent parents and masters must check their naughty passions in any way which they have in their power and force them into decent and proper behaviour, and into what are called good habits.

The Christian church has periodically been beset by its spiritual malcontents, known as "enthusiasts" and the Established Church of England has proved to be no exception.[1] The Eighteenth century methodistical revivals seemed to produce an outpouring from the hearts of ignorant and rude men and it was no small wonder that Churchmen right into the mid-nineteenth century found the accompanying public displays of emotion all too vulgar and the emphasis on one's sinfulness and hellfire rather droll and tasteless. As the Duchess of Buckingham was reputed to have said to the Countess of Huntingdon, "It is monstrous to be told you have a heart as sinful as the common wretches that crawl on the earth."[2]

The Church was suspicious of the enthusiasm that was sweeping the countryside with converts falling into fits and faintings, ardours and transports, and various other bizarre physical manifestations of the Holy Spirit.[3] That the *Holy Spirit* was responsible was simply incomprehensible. A Christian gentleman did not babble unintelligible nonsense; he did not rant and rave irrationally, nor did he rebuke and reproach immoderately and he was not given to effusions and frenzies. Surely the Holy Spirit was no less? Methodism had become the popular religious experience of the working classes given that the Church had little "passion for Souls". Nevertheless, that worldly and accommodating church did manage to produce enthusiasts of its own who combatted sin and vice and taught the poor to be not only content with their stations but eternally grateful, especially for the benefits of evangelical religion.

The Church of England evangelicals directed their mindboggling surplus of energies toward "those who counted" and the reformation of manners became a matter of duty and proseltyzing a positive rage.[4] This evangelical trend lasted well into the nineteenth century when the Salvation Army continued the tradition by drumming out "Onward Christian Soldiers" in the backstreets and alleys and the object of "trusteeship" was a Christian imperative to civilize and christianize the rest of the world having civilized and christianized England.[5] The piety of the pre-Victorian nursery had become the patriotism of the Victorian nursery and the evangelical impulse became part of the parcel of the social fabric even when it became de-emphasised in content.[6]

With unflagging zeal the evangelicals fairly bull-dozed their way into "useful" activities and "good works". They opposed lotteries, drunkeness, obscenity, bullbaiting, atheists, brothel keepers, dance halls, radicals, fairs, gypsies and sabbath breakers, with equal zeal and equal discrimination. They endowed, subscribed to, and founded, anti-slavery campaigns, bible societies, missionary societies to convert the heathen and the Jews, Climbing Boys Asylums, lunatic asylums, infirmaries, fever institutions, penitentaries and sunday schools. They helped inform gentlewomen, distressed widows, juvenile mendicants, fallen women and orphans. They passionately rescued the labourer from his gin, the prostitute from her earnings, the cleric from his nominalism and the rake from his stews. Religion was as popular in politics as it was in the pulpit.[7]

Heroic battalions of Evangelicals fought like Arthur's knights against all conceivable vices and infidelity. They spoke in superlatives and enthused with expletives about "true and vital religion". As slothful servants, fallen women, unfaithful spouses and unkind masters could say their prayers and subscribe to the thirty-nine articles some more good evidence was required as a sign of one's personal salvation, therefore, philanthropy and benevolence were positive demonstrations of witnessing Christ Crucified.[8] The evangelicals passionately preached, enthusiastically converted and just as enthusiastically became converted, untiringly engaged in good works, *and zealously raised their childern in the fear and love of God.*

It is this latter part of evangelical living that deserves further examination. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, popular children's literature bore the imprint of evangelical child-rearing attitudes even when not directly evangelical. A basic tenet of evangelicalism was that social or human improvability was not possible without the moral training necessary to counteract the evil impulses within people. Salvation could not cure human depravity but it could certainly minimize its frightful potential. All Christians, even the nominal kind, usually agreed THAT CHILDREN WERE NOT NATURALLY GOOD. Indeed, the presumption was that children were naturally evil and burdened by this sad fact, children were prone to all manner of naughtinesses. Children's literature tried to remedy the situation by being supremely didactic. The popular children's literature until the mid-nineteenth century sought to edify, instruct, alarm, caution and improve.

This essay will use three examples of children's literature by Mary Martha Sherwood, a pious author during the first half of the nineteenth century, when religion became not merely popular but indeed, downright fashionable both within the Church of England and without.[9] The first book, *The History of the Fairchild Family* (1818), was never intended to entertain because it was essentially a conduct book prescribing how moral instruction ought to be perceived.[10] This is made explicit in the subtitle–' A Child's Manual, Being a Collection of Stories Calculated to Show the Importance and Effects of Religious Education." This book was the most popular of Mrs. Sherwood's some 350 works, and underwent several editions. We can therefore surmise its persistent influence and suppose that "few children of the gentry and in the Sunday Schools could have escaped her fury..."[11]

Mrs. Sherwood made her views on innate depravity clear from the outset and throughout the book she solemnly re-iterated these views just in case the reader had either forgotten or misunderstood. The fictitous Mrs. Fairchild, the mother of Lucy, Emily and Henry, reminded her three children that after Adam and Eve's fall from grace, "All their children, who have since been born in their likeness, are utterly and entirely sinful..."[12] The conversation that followed was a reflection of the common method of catechetical instruction of the day and her children all replied by quoting whole chunks of scripture.[13] Six year old Henry's verse must have given his solicitous mamma no end of pleasure. "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh dwelleth no good thing."[14]

Religion possibly became more palatable and more easily absorbed into society because of a shift in the concepts of human nature and childhood which were reflected in the gradual theological shift from the Calvinist strain in evangelicalism to an increasing Arminianism. The doctrine of the Elect became less favoured and the Arminian doctrine of the accessibility of salvation to all who believed, became more attractive. Original Sin was no longer seen as a permanently damning blight on the immortal soul if one became "saved" as John Wesley had preached in his beliefs on Christian Perfection and Assurance.[15] Mrs. Sherwood's unerring statement of human depravity in her *Fairchild Family* is undoubtedly one reason why the Fairchild children no longer gambolled their way through the late Victorian nursery.

Man and his institutions were seen as improvable if not perfectable and the new theology reflected a laissez faire economy bursting out its mercantilist seams. The economy was based on a philosophy of will rather than determinism--that is, on man's ability to overcome his limitations. If his soul was not permanently crippled by original sin but redeemed from it through New Birth then this was both a kindlier and more hopeful sign of his improvability. Related ideas on infant wickedness and child obstinacy too were moderated as the family turned more in on itself and gravitated the more around its children. The new educators, like Froebel and Pestalozzi, influenced the world of children and replaced Mrs. Sherwood's rigid discipline which had after all primarily been intended to curb the child's depraved nature.[16]

The Fairchild Family is in itself an interesting reflection of this theological shift toward Arminian beliefs. At times Mrs. Sherwood demonstrates her Calvinistic leanings and at other times she appears to tend toward Arminianism.[17]

Early in the book a conversation between Mr. Fairchild and his children demonstrate her calvinism.

> "O papa, papa!" said the children, "pray for us that we may not be wicked and go to hell."
>
> "I would have you remember my dear children," said Mr. Fairchild, "that there is no such thing as being saved, except by the Lord Jesus Christ. . . . nothing you can do yourselves can save you. Even if you could, from this time forward live without sin, yet you are condemned already for your past sins."

Just as the shift was often subtle and certainly gradual and it was to take several generations of evangelicals before Arminianism finally triumphed, Mrs. Sherwood too seemed to vacillate. Parts two and three of her book, written after 1818, showed a gradual modification of her views on original sin. By the end of her book man is able to some extent improve his spiritual state by cooperating in Redemption as is evidenced when two characters Annie and Jonas agree to baptism and Annie, one of Mrs. Sherwood's pious children dies and "the redeemed dove passed the portals of the gates of everlasting glory." The Fairchild children's naughty little lives are filled with calvinistic thunderings, doctrinal controversies, sermons, homilies, as well as some macabre events and some alarming truths. The surprising thing about Emily, Lucy, and Henry, was that they remained throughout the book quite delightful children and given all their lessons they appeared to learn them not too well at all! Although this triumph of naughtiness over moral training was intended to show the invincibility of original sin, it seems to show the resilience of the human spirit.

Three themes are easily identified in *The Fairchild Family* as common examples used in the formation of children's characters. The three themes are (1) obedience to parents; (2) the All-Seeing God; (3) the certainty of death. These themes are found elsewhere in the children's literature of the day.

Like the Fairchilds, evangelical parents "did not wish their dear little children to be handsome, or rich, or powerful . . . all they desired for them was the blessing of God."[18] To gain such blessing their children had to be taught that original sin was an unescapable fact of life. It could not be left to chance for children to discover its awful truths for themselves so they were told it at the earliest possible age. Parents were to mediate the lives of their children and to guide them so that they might be protected from the corrupting influences of the world and within themselves. The Fairchild parents typically viewed themselves as God's viceroys on earth. "I stand in the place of God to you; whilst you are a child and as long as I do not ask you to do anything wrong you must obey me," Mr. Fairchild grimly told his children.[19] And his children could just as grimly quote Proverbs 30:17 to their father. "The eye that mocketh at his father, and despiseth to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out and the young eagles shall eat it."

Although it was sorrowfully recognized that a child could not be saved by good habits alone it seemed equally unlikely that he could be saved without them. Moral instruction could not cure the incurable--man was evil no matter how moral his external conduct might be--but moral instruction could overcome ignorance about man's evil nature. Sin was the outcome of this natural depravity and to remain in ignorance was no restraint for one's evil impulses. Therefore moral instruction would aid in taking the soul from darkness into light and children were trained to fight against their evil impulses. Children were not innocent, only ignorant and it was a parental duty to meliorate their ignorance. The evangelical parent took upon himself the responsibilities of instruction and discipline courageously. He instilled religious knowledge and if need be he did not spare the rod to temper his charges' irascible whims. "With-hold not correction from the child; thou beatest him with the rod and shall deliver him from hell."[20] However, persuasion was acknowledged to be preferable to whipping as the evangelical stress on sermonizing their children shows.

Children learned that by obeying their parents they were also obeying God for if they could be trusted to honour their father and mother then the honour of God naturally followed. Submission to Authority was part of evangelical living for evangelicalism did not impute to challenge the tenets of a well-ordered society in which every person knew his place. Submission and obedience in the home were but pre-requisites for an ordered society. The evangelicals had not come to subvert authority but to defend it. They had not come to bury Caesar but to praise him.[21] Of course, parents hoped discipline and obedience would become fully internalized and external controls be relinquished. The tediously gradual nature of such internalization of obedience was stressed throughout *The Fairchild Family.*

No doubt her little dears gave Mrs. Fairchild a knowing nod when she stressed that "a child who has good principles will behave just the same when his mamma is out of the room as when she is looking at him. . . ."[22] However, on at least one occasion the children proved otherwise when their pious parents left them in the care of the domestics for a day. They began the day with such frivolity as making "babies out of pillows,"[23] and they finished the day by becoming tipsy on Mrs. Freeman's cidar. (Mrs. Freeman was "bad company" and a member of the lower orders!)[24] Finally, Emily nearly lost her life on a swing--a popular means of warning children against frivolity. Children's literature of the period was full of cautionary tales about all manner of dangerous objects and occupations. These included swings, see-saws, tops, gun-powder, escaped lions and papists. Nailbiting, sniffling and dying of dropsy were not excluded.[25] *The Fairchild Family* had its fair share of such caution as well as an equal share of another popular theme, that of repentance. At the end of such a wicked day Emily confessed in fear and trembling that "We have been very wicked children today. We are not fit to come near you." Her parents concurred.[26]

The Fairchild parents conceded as did actual evangelical parents that God had the final authority over men, angels and children.

> "Who can take the selfishness out of the breast of a child? Can parents? Can good teachers? No! Who then can? God only can create a clean heart in the breast of a child."[27]

However, it must be added that although only God could perform these wonders, evangelical parents certainly assisted him.

The main responsibility of evangelical parents, after the giving of good family life, was to prepare their children for conversion by teaching them all the moral precepts of true and vital Christianity. Although their children were not necessarily guaranteed saving grace they had advantages over the children of non-believers or nominal Christians *if they were properly brought up.* This couldn't be left to chance. For those with calvinist learnings, a zealous enforcement of morality on others was evidence to oneself and to the world of saving grace. For those with Arminian leanings it was a means of bringing their children to salvation and preventing those who were already saved from backsliding. They emphasied conversion so that their children might not confuse "real" Christianity with Nominal Christianity. Mr. Fairchild stated to his children "this awful truth . . . that, vile and abominable as the heathen are, there is another order of people . . . in countries calling themselves Christian . . . who condemnation in the world to come is to be feared. One of the more graphic illustrations of such anger was in the story of Miss Augusta Noble, aged nine or thereabouts, who met a most unenviable death by being burned alive because by all accounts she was vain and disobedient.[29]

Both Arminian and Calvinist evangelicals, and those like Mrs. Sherwood who were a curious admixture of both, could not stress moral instruction of their children enough. If one detects a certain anomoly in the preaching and the practices of the Calvinists, who on the one hand believed in irresistible grace and the Elect, yet instructed their children as if they believed in Arminian principles. This anomoly is easily resolved. Like the Puritans before them, The Calvinist evangelicals held to ideas of the convenant between God and man. God had given the original covenant to Abraham and his "seed" as long as they remained faithful to it. Thus these "new Israelites" likewise believed that their descendants were also of the chosen people and part of the convenant was to instruct their children in keeping that covenant.[30]

The Fairchild children were exemplars for evangelical children. They learned to quote scripture, practised self-examination, said their prayers, kept their daily diaries and they confessed their faults and supervised each other's.[31] In short they learned obedience. Parents were deputies for a merciful but just God and they gave out punishments both suited to the sin and to bring the child to submission. As Mrs. Fairchild kindly explained, "For this purpose I and your papa often used punishments, as you call them, whilst you were, as we had reason to think, as yet unblessed with strong religious principles.[32] However, children being naturally evil found such obedience difficult to attain particularly when their parents were not present to constantly remind them. Evangelical literature explains how to circumvent this problem; by the use of "guilt." Mrs. Fairchild, for example, seduced her children to trust her with all their secrets "I love you . . . nothwithstanding which, I know you have a wicked heart . . . . When you are a child you must tell your sins to me."[33] Such confessional conversations were not only encouraged but were insisted upon. For Arminian parents the problem of reminding children of their unworthiness was crucial for if free-will became important then Christians could also "backslide ' from a state of grace.[34] As parents could not be around all the time and children were not naturally good the device used for such supervision and to arouse a sense of guilt was an all-powerful and all-seeing God who knew the child's most secret vice and innermost thought. He was always there. He was always watching.

Isaac Watts had immortalized the theme of an all-seeing God in the previous century in a hymn which most evangelical children knew.

> Almighty God, thy piercing eye,
>   Strikes thro the shades of night,
> And our most secret actions lie,
>   All open to thy sight.
>
> O may I now forever fear
>   To indulge a sinful thought;
> Since the great God can see, and hear,
>   And writes down every fault![35]

Things had not altered radically a century later if one considers the hymn "Thou God See'st Me."

> When every eye around me sleeps
>   May I not sin without control?
> No, for a constant watch He keeps
>   On every thought of every soul.[36]

Mrs. Sherwood devoted many pages to the theme of the All-Seeing God. For example, Emily yielded to the temptation of stealing damsons and as a result she caught a chill as punishment and almost died. Henry too was punished by the All-Seeing God when he stole an apple and felt the pangs of remorse afterward.[37]

The Fairchild children, and probably real evangelical children, were often fighting against temptation and less frequently overcoming it. As if temporal punishment for their waywardness was not sufficient they had the dread certainty of being punished in the hereafter unless they repented. They possessed that terrible knowledge that disobedience to one's parents implied disobedience to God and that this God was always watching them. As if this knowledge was not enough they were constantly hearing tales embellished by death, corpses, coffins, and baleful threats of hell. To emphasize the three themes under discussion, Mrs. Sherwood relished lurid deathbed scenes. Burning children, decomposing neighbors, corpses on gibbets, life-ebbing diseases and heart-broken parents--these were the sweetmeats she fed her readers.

It was not so much peculiarly evangelical as generally nineteenth century that the subject of death and dying was a preoccupation of children's literature Indeed we cannot even assume that such embellishments with which Mrs. Sherwood indulged her readers were as effectively frightening as we might imagine. That some effect was expected can be assumed, otherwise Mrs. Sherwood and other authors would not have stressed death as they did. However, given a society where life was not at all guaranteed for the newborn or for the young, and not overly prolonged for the adult, this was not a surprising emphasis.[38] Infants died at birth and mothers died giving birth. Brothers and sisters died of all manner of strange maladies and some not so strange. Fathers died manly deaths and the poor died from neglect, starvation and overwork. Criminals died in prison or by hanging. Widows and orphans abounded as did step-mothers, step-fathers and guardians

The attitude toward death was quite unlike the attitude toward it in contemporary society where it has become almost an obscenity to discuss let alone to see. The dying today are allowed their lonely and frightening experiences inside sterile institutions and the dead are prettied up by morticians.[39] In nineteenth century England, Mrs. Sherwood "found deathbeds easy to depict and certain to command attention."[40] She had five infants of her own that had died. Once again we might call upon Isaac Watts' song for children to remind us of a society accustomed to short lives.

There is an hour when I must die,
Nor do I know how soon 'twill come,
A Thousand children young as I,
Are called by death to hear their doom.[41]

Infant mortality rates were apparently not any better a century later when ' About Dying" was written in stanzas which became increasingly more maudlin than the following.

Tell me mamma, if I must die,
One day as little baby died,
And look so very pale and lie,
Down in the pit-hole by its side?[42]

And a hymn called "A Child's Grave" lamented,

What is this little grassy mound,
Where pretty daisies bloom,
What is it there lying under ground?
It is an infant's tomb.[43]

Mrs. Sherwood was scarcely alone in her depictions of death and dying but Mrs. Sherwood was particularly apt at them.

For the evangelicals the reality and constancy of death around them made their mission even more urgent. Man was born evil and neither were children free from original sin. They were capable of the extremes of wickedness but gave little indication of being capable of the extremes of goodness. The evangelicals and Mrs. Sherwood equated physical decay with the corruption of the human soul. Mr. Fairchild made this explicit when he took his children on an "instructive" excursion to visit the gardener who had died just a day or two previously. The gardener's face was yellow and looked "ghastly horrible" and there was a "disagreeable smell" of death about the cottage. Mr. Fairchild none too gently explained that these signs of decay were mild when compared to the decay of the human soul. Even though the deceased gardener's widow effused her reply, "Oh, Sir! It comforts me to hear you talk," one may be less certain the children who read it were as comforted.[44] Evangelicals were more sympathetic to John Locke's ideas on education than Rousseau and took his advice on sense data as an instructive tool to its logical extreme.

If children were forced to bear the burden of always obeying their parents, adults had to bear the weightier burden of responsibility for their children's immortal souls. Parents were not answerable to God for final wilfulness on the part of their children but they were answerable if they failed to give them *correct instruction.* Mrs. Sarah Trimmer, another very evangelical lady, listed such rules for correct instruction in *Instructive Tales*, and these rules were in congruence with the precepts elaborated in Mrs. Sherwood's book. The instructions included

17

submission to parents; the use of example; never suffering children to be idle; representing vice in its greatest deformity and virtue in its most pleasing dress; correcting vanity, pride, spend-thriftness, sabbath-breaking, anger, impatience, sloth, folly, discontent and lying; and finally, reminding children often of the shortness of life and the constancy of death.[45]

The last point consisted of being prepared for the latter even at the expense of enjoying the former. Nineteenth century literature told and retold it.[46] Smallpox, dissipations, licentiousness, wanton songs, boasting, quarreling, ostentation, impertinence and parsimony were as sternly condemned as children who kicked dogs, pulled wings off flies or pulled pussy's tail. The writers wrote as earnestly about giddy girls as about heart-rending confinements. Some stories went to astonishing length to use death as the final and permanent remedy for even the mildest misdemeanours. An example (and a favourite of mine) is the sad tale of Louisa who was quite wilful and without any feelings of compassion. After running over a child in her carriage she went into a nearby inn and consumed plum cake and two cups of hot chocolate while the crowd tore her carriage into a thousand pieces. Sometime later she was recognized by her fiance who jilted her. She died a frightful death at age twenty one.[47]

Undoubtedly emphasis on death was a reflection of the society itself but although death was commonplace, evangelical parents dared not risk it being viewed as in any way ordinary. Certainly death was commonplace but it also crept upon one "like a thief in the night" and worse than physical death was spiritual death. Evangelical parents and their children had to be prepared for the day of judgment. For Calvinists, whether eternity would be joyful or frightful depended in the final analysis on God's will, and for Arminans to no little extent it depended upon one's preparation. Did not the children's hymn "Solemn Thoughts on God and Death" demonstrate the ideal of preparation and Christian perfectability?

Let me improve the hours I have,
  Before the day of grace is fled,
There's no repentance in the grave,
  Nor pardon offered to the dead.[48]

Disobedience to parents, the All-Seeing God, and the Certainty of Death–these were the three themes predominant in the Evangelical Tale as represented by *The Fairchild Family*. The aim of such edification was to produce a "serious" Christian. Children could not depend upon themselves for salvation because they were corrupted from conception. For Calvinist evangelicals, God's grace saved them, and for the more generous Arminians only Christ could redeem them and Him Crucified.

It has been suggested that *The Fairchild Family* revealed Mrs. Sherwood's theological confusions. She had not entirely settled her evangelicalism into one camp or the other and her religious convictions were clearly a mixture of Calvinistic hangovers and Arminianism. It has also been suggested that this confusion was not uncommon to the evangelical movement generally and many evangelicals were similarly contradictory.[49] It is therefore interesting to note Mrs. Sherwood on one hand roaring the doctrine of original sin and on the other hand using an additional theme, that of the "romantic child." Admittedly, the romantic children she portrayed were not innocent as Blake's children were, nor were they born free of original sin. However, they were pure children who were able to transcend this tawdry world in a simplicity that brought stiffnecked and unbelieving adults down in humility and wonder. Mrs. Sherwood used two such children in *Little Henry and His Bearer* (1814) and *The Flowers of the Forest* (1839).

Little Henry was more of an "Arminian" character than a Calvinist for although he was tainted by original sin and probably not one of the Elect, he was saved through an act of faith. He accepted Christ's gift of salvation to all men who believed. Little Henry was taught religious principles and converted by a Christian lady who "made a methodist, a downright canting methodist of the boy," much to his mother's horror.[50] Henry succeeds in converting both his mother, and his bearer, Boosy, after telling him India would be a good country if it became Christian because then the people "would not be so idle as they are not."[51] Mrs. Sherwood would allow for no backsliding in this tale and described the demises of both Henry and Boosy "although there are but few persons who love to meditate upon scenes as death."[52] Mrs. Sherwood was one of them.

Just as Little Henry was an Arminian, so too was, Aimee, in *The Flowers of the Forest*.[53] This story stresses an anti-papist stance, and the date of writing, 1839, makes this stance understandable. By that date the Tractarians had caused a furore in society with their leanings toward anglo-catholicism and eventually Romanism itself. Evangelicals and even nominal Christians were in a panic about what they feared to be a threat of a Popish plot. Briefly, Aimee, whose innocent beauty was not unlike the Infant Jesus himself (and like him, she was an anglo-saxon and a protestant) was educated in a French Academy. She was able to change this disreputable institution where dissension, deceit, vanity, pride, envy and frivolity prevailed. On her deathbed she also managed to convert a priest who crossed himself in what amounted to his last papist gesture. During the nineteenth century such anti-catholic themes were the pap fed to protestant youngsters and finally led the way to the more salacious diatribes such as *The Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk*.[54] Many characters in evangelical stories led lives that pointed to the outrageous heresies of Romanism and the positive virtues of Protestantism.

Mrs. Sherwood did not actually compromise her firm stand on original sin by creating Little Henry and Aimee as examples of piety.

She had in The Fairchild Family introduced two similar examples in the characters of Charles Trueman who was "one of the most pious little boys in that county,"[55] and the Waldensian boy who converted his catholic family to evangelical protestantism. All children died untimely but exceedingly gratifying deaths unspotted by mortal sin and absolved of the less interesting venial type. All children had been virtuous but were not innocent.[56] They possessed that awful knowledge that they were not naturally good. Unlike the Rousseauian child, despite the environment, they were already spoiled. Unlike the Lockean child, despite good habits, they were damned unless they "believed.'[57]

All of Mrs. Sherwood's romantic children were good only because they had been saved. They were not born pure; they became pure. Salvation was demonstrated through changed behaviours and that is why these children were so insufferably good. The only satisfactory literary device, common to the period, was to have them die young before the world seduced them and they could backslide. The theme of the "saved' romantic child is not uncommon to evangelical literature. Such children shed their nasty habits and converted misers, drunkards, infidels, and nominal Christians. Mothers and fathers, as well as the lower orders, were persuaded to see the error of their ways. Fathers took the pledge; mothers stopped nagging husbands; maiden aunts read the Bible; hardened men were saved on their deathbeds; priests became protestants and non-abstainers come to see that even "tippling" led to heartbreak.[58]

Mrs. Sherwood's children were Arminian rather than Calvinist. They had been "saved" by their own acts of faith. In true Arminian spirit they were used to spread the "good news" and witness their good fortune. They were part of Wesley's "peculiar people" with "a passion to save souls" and the world was their parish. Strict Calvinistic tenets logically disallowed this proselytization. Mrs. Sherwood's use of these children is but a reflection of her time. By the first decade of the nineteenth century there was an upsurge of missionary activity and evangelical energies to support the conversion of the "heathen." The Arminian doctrines that said all men might be saved contributed to this upsurge in missionary and benevolent societies in England itself whose primary aim was to convert the heathen abroad and the unconverted at home.

In conclusion the evangelical influence on society and on children's literature cannot be underestimated. Many evangelical child-rearing attitudes and practices remained in society only to be modified by the prevailing vogues of sentiment, humanitarianism, reform and Rousseau. If Mrs. Sherwood became gradually tender toward childhood this is probably because society was becoming increasingly more so.[59] Edmund Gosse, Samuel Butler, George Eliot, the Barretts and the Brontes, are but a few examples of real-life Fairchild children and even then, only the exceptionally talented examples. The more ordinary products of the Evangelical Nursery can but be speculated upon. The literature written by Evangelicals was more widely read than in evangelical circles and this literature merely reflected the popular concepts of childhood and family. Evangelical child-rearing was intended to polish taste, regulate temper, cultivate reason, direct the feelings and subdue the passions. It was also intended to train to self denial, and refer all actions, feelings and sentiments, tastes and passions to the love and fear of God. Finally, if children of pious parents turned ill, "there had been some mistake, some neglect, or some fault on the part of the parents; *that they had not used the right methods.*"[60]

One can only ponder this statement. The popular literature of original sin has since been replaced by the popular literature of Infantile Sexuality. Character training has been replaced by personality growth, yet the argument has not altered significantly. Contemporary parents still suffer self-recrimination if their offspring become anything less than was hoped for them.

NOTES

[1] The eighteenth century revivals in England are discussed in the following:

G. R. Balleine, *A History of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England* (London: Longman's Green, 1909); Robert Southey, *The Life of Wesley and the Rise and Progress of Methodism* (London: Frederik Warner and Co., 1889); Frank Baker, *John Wesley and the Church of England* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1970); John H. Overton and Frederic Relton, *The English Church From the Accession of George I to the End of the Eighteenth Century, 1714-1800* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1906); C. J. Abbey and J. H. Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century* (Long: Longman's Green and Co., 1896); A Tindal Hart, *The Curate's Lot--The Story of the Unbeneficed English Clergy* (London: John Baker Ltd., 1970), Elie Halevy, *England in 1815* (London: Ernest Benn, 1961) and R. A. Knox, *Enthusiasm--A Chapter in the History of Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950); T. B. Shepherd, *Methodism and the Literature of the Eighteenth Century* (London: The Epworth Press, 1947); Frederick C. Gill, *The Romantic Movement and the Methodists* (London: The Epworth Press, 1937); Albert M. Lyles, *Methodism Mocked--The Satiric Reaction to Methodism in the Eighteenth Century* (London: The Epworth Press, 1960); Umphrey Lee, *The Historical Background of Early Methodist Enthusiasm* (New York: Ams Press, Inc., 1967); Asa Briggs, *The Making of Modern England, 1783-1867* (New York: Harper and Row, 1959); David Newsome, *The Parting of Friends: A Study of the Wilberforces and Henry Manning* (London: John Murray, 1966); Canon Charles Smyth, "The Evangelical Discipline" in *Ideas and Beliefs of the Victorians* (B.B.C. Sylvan Press, 1949), pp. 97-104; Gordon Rupp, "Evangelicalism of the Non-Conformists," *Ibid.*, pp. 105-112; Walter Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-70* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957); G. M. Young, *Portrait of an Aye* (Oxford University Press, 1936); G. Kitson Clark, *The Making of Victorian England* (New York: Atheneum Press, 1968) and Lytton Strachey, *Eminent Victorians* (London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1918).

[2] Abbey and Overton, pp. 226-277 and 279-312. Halevy, pp. 389-410. *The Anti-Jacobin Review* represented High Church and Tory reaction. For example, it contained harsh criticisms of the "whine and cant of the Tabernacle" and the "fanatical exertions of those spurious philanthropists who are labouring to puritanize." Vol. L, (July, 1816), pp. 637 and 654. Another Journal, the *Edinburgh Review*, was as volatile. Sidney Smith asks, "Are we to respect the poor when they wish to step out of their province and become teachers of the land? When men whose proper talk is of bullocks pretend to have wisdom and understanding...." *Edinburgh Review* (April, 1808), p. 144.

J. L. Hammond and Barbara Hammond, *The Town Labourer, 1760-1832* (London: Longmans Green and Co., 1920), argue that the Established Church was a "class" appendage with no room in it for an enthusiastic cobbler or a saved tinker.

[3] E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968), in his chapter "The Transforming Power of the Cross" Describes such manifestations. Pp. 385-429.

John Wesley's diaries are replete with such descriptions. A few entries may illustrate this. On 12 October, 1739, he refers to "two persons who were tormented in an unaccountable manner, and seemed to be indeed lunatic." On 24 August, 1743, a man had "a rattling in his throat attended with a hideous groaning" and another "seemed dead." The fifties were no less enthusiastic for on June 21, 1752, a man "screamed and hallooed" and others broke the pews with their violent struggling while still others seemingly unaffected during the revival meeting dropped "as dead" on their way home. *The Journal of John Wesley* (London: Epworth Press, 1938), vols. 2, 3 and 4.

[4] In 1787 the Proclamation Society For the Suppression of Vice and Immorality was formed to implement the King's suggestions toward cleaning up society. It was formally recognized in 1802. Halevy, p. 452. Ford K. Brown, *Fathers of the Victorians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), presents the thesis that Methodism appealed to the wrong sort of people and that manners and morals altered once "those who counted" were recruited into the evangelical ranks. He evidences that the wealthy and influential who came under the sway of religious revivalism were numerous.

[5] Bernard Semmel, *The Methodist Revolution* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), Chapter 6, "Practical Arminianism and England's World Mission," pp. 146-169.

[6] Evangelical religion was of course a trans-atlantic phenonemon as was its urge to social reform as is seen in Clifford S. Griffin, *Their Brother's Keepers: Moral Stewardship in the United States*, 1800-1865 (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rugers University Press, 1960) and Carrol Smith Rosenberg, *Religion and the Rise of the American City: The New York Mission Movement*, 1812-1870 (Ithica: Correll University Press, 1971). Bernard Wishy, *The Child and the Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968), relates evangelical religion and republican patriotism.

[7] The best known of the political reforms that the evangelicals adopted as their "cause" were the Abolition of the slave trade (1807) and the Emancipation of the slaves (1833). The Clapham Sect was well known for its political involvement. See Ernest Marshall Howse, *Saints in Politics* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1952).

[8] William Wilberforce, *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians in the High and Middle Classes in this Country contrasted with Real Christianity* (London: 1797), makes this point explicit. He regarded "the respect, approbation, and favour of men" as "conducive to the highest intrinsic excellence...." Pp. 182-188. The setting forward of "benevolent and useful schemes" was a bright example of a good life and good works were the "cardinal point on which the whole of [vital] Christianity turns."pp. 277-278 and 196.

[9] Mrs. Sherwood wrote prolifically until her death in 1851.

[10] Mary Martha Sherwood, *The History of the Fairchild Family, on The Child's Manual* (London: James Nisbet and Co., undated), to be refined throughout as *The Fairchild Family.*

[11] Naomi Royde Smith, *The State of Mind of Mrs. Sherwood* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1946), p. xiv. Jonathon Gathorne-Hardy, *The Rise and Fall of the British Nanny* (London: Arrow Books, 1972), stresses the use of the book in the Victorian nursery. There were five editions in 1818 alone, the first year of publication to be followed by further editions as late as 1875, 1876, 1879, 1889, 1902 and even 1913.

[12] *The Fairchild Family*, p. 44.

[13] Catechisms which used the scripture-answer method were made up for charity children, younger children, Sunday School scholars and for the instruction of youth. It was not a method devised solely for religious instruction. Catechisms were available for house economy, metaphysics, useful knowledge, arguments against sectaries, on the rights and duties of natural man, shorthand and even minerology. Poetry replies were as popular as scriptural ones. The British Museum Library has an awe inspiring collection of such catechisms.

[14] *The Fairchild Family*, p. 15. Quoted from Romans 7:18.

[15] "Brief Thoughts on Christian Perfection," XI, (1777), "A Plain Account of Christian Perfection as Believed and Though by the Rev. Mr. J. Wesley," XI (1777), "A Circumcision of the Heart," V (1733), "The Question, What is an Arminian? Answered by a Lover of Free Grace," X (1770), "Salvation by Faith," V (1738) and "Serious Thoughts Upon the Perseverance of the Saints," X (1751). All in *The Works of John Wesley*, 5th edition (London: John Mason, 1860).

[16] James Nichols, *Calvinism and Arminianism Compared* (London, 1824), and Andrew Fuller, *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation* (London, 1781) the contemporary illustrations of this theological shift. The Particular Baptists also modified their Predestinarian inclinations as evidenced in A. C. Underwood, *A History of the English Baptists* (London: The Carey Kingsgate Press, 1950).

On April 26, 1739, Wesley recorded, "While I was preaching at Newgate on these words, 'He that believeth in me hath everlasting life' I was enseasibly led without any previous design, to declare strongly and explicitly that God willeth *all men to be thus saved*" The other great methodist leader stuck to his Calvinist beliefs and in March 1840 wrote from Georgia to Wesley, "I am ten thousand times more convinced of the doctrine of election and the final perseverance." that is the impossibilty of the elect falling from grace. Semmel, p. 41.

[17] *The Fairchild Family*, p. 18.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 149 and 84.

[20] Proverbs 23:13-14; *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[21] Well known evangelicals of the day stressed this, such as Wilberforce, Hannah More and Sarah Trimmer. Secondary source analysis support the observation including Ford K. Brown, op. cit.; Elie Halevy, op. cit.; E. P. Thompson, op. cit.; J. L. and Barbara Hammond, op. cit.; John McLeish, *Evangelical Religion and Popular Education* (London: Methuen & Co., 1969); and E. J. Hobsbawm, "Methodism and the Threat of Revolution in Britain," *History Today*, VII, 2 (February, 1957), pp. 115-125.

[22] *The Fairchild Family*, p. 21.

[23] The children were merely pounding their pillows into the appropriate shapes.

[24] Although somewhat incidental to disobedience, Mrs. Fairchild reveals much about another aspect of social commentary. Her Aunt Grace reprimanded her when she was a child and stole some cherries, not only for theft but also for keeping such "low company", "after all the care we have taken with you and the delicate manner in which we reared you." *Ibid.*, p. 24. Another popular children's writer, Sarah Trimmer, makes the same point in *The Fabulous Histories: The Robins, or Domestic Life Among the Birds and Anecodotes of Other Animals* (New York: C. S. Francis & Co., 1851). When Robin, Flapsy, Dicky and Pecksy Redbreast (such incongruous names!) learn about the undoing of their Chaffinch neighbour, Mrs. Chaffinch solemnly observes, "My nestling is lost through his own folly. I cautioned him repeatedly not to make acquaintance with sparrows, knowing they would lead him into mischief...." p. 125.

[25] For an entertaining assortment of such cautionary tales see Andrew W. Tuer, *Stories from Old-Fashioned Children's Books* (London: The Leadenhall Press Led., 1899) and Gillian Avery, *Nineteenth Century Children--Heroes and Heroines in English Children's Stories, 1780-1900* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965).

[26] Scenes of repentance are common in *The Fairchild Family* as they were in children's literature generally. Accompanied by every sob was the inestimable forgiveness of parents. For example Henry repents for refusing to learn his Latin lessons but prostrates himself at the Pre-Victorian patriarchal feet sobbing his remorse. Pp. 147-150. In Mrs. Trimmer's *Fabulous Histories* Robin supplicates himself at his father's feet and cries, "Yes, my dear indulgent father, permit me to make my grateful acknowledgements for your kindness and assure you of my future obedience." P. 95.

[27] *The Fairchild Family*, p. 22.

[28] *The Fairchild Family*, p. 17.

[29] *The Fairchild Family*, pp. 84-86.

[30] Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966) and *Visible Saints* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1963) discusses this idea and claims that such belief, in New England at least, led to a tribalism that repressed the evangelical impulse. In keeping with the gospel injunction of "Go forth into all the world" the Arminian breakthrough then can be argued as both welcome and necessary to Christianity.

[31] Lucy's diary entry, written at 9½ years of age included the following:

"Mamma gave Emily a bit of muslim...and I was envious and hated Emily...though I knew it was wicked." *The Fairchild Family*, p. 53.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 176. Also see Edmund Gosse, *Father and Son, A Study of Two Temperaments* (London: Heinemann, 1907), who stated that his evangelical father was "in a tremendous hurry to push on my growth" and 'fed me theological meat which was impossible for me to digest." P. 83.

[33] *The Fairchild Family*, p. 31. This reminds me of Samuel Butler's *The Way of All Flesh* (London: Penguin Books, 1966). One of the most poignant scenes in this novel is the "confidential talk" young Ernest has with his stern evangelical mother. Here we see the distress, the guilt and the remorse, his mother's zeal for his moral conduct caused. Pp. 196-201.

[34] Jabez Bunting who took over the Weslyan Conference after Wesley warned against backsliding and said it was a Christian's duty to continue "to confess and lament even pardoned sin." *Sermon on Justification by Faith* (Leeds: 1813), p. 11.

[35] Isaac Watts, *Divine and Moral Songs for the Use of Children* (London: Darton & Co., undated). This poem was called "The All-Seeing God," p. 23. See also "Against Lying" (p. 17) and "Obedience to Parents" (32).

[36] Anne and Jane Taylor, *Hymns for Infant Minds* (49th ed., London: Hodder and Staughton, 1868), No. XXX.

[37] An undated, but probably early nineteenth century series of lessons, *Reading and Spelling Made Easy Containing Nearly Two Hundred Progressive Lessons of Reading and Spelling, Arranged for Every Day of the Week and Month*, by J. Furseman (London: Bird & Ackland) includes daily exhortations to be read and copied. One lesson in syllablization says, "The eye of God is on all men. He can see all we do." Many of the lessons stress obedience to parents.

[38] Ivy Pinchbeck and Margaret Hewitt quote from Parliamentary Papers, 1864, XXII, where Sir James Shuttleworth observes, "Owing in a great degree to neglect and mismanagement half the children born in 1831 died in five years. The chief part of the mortality occurred in the first two years." Thirty years later attention was drawn to the fact that "In England and Wales, it is shown by the Returns of the Registrar General that of 1,000 children born alive, 737 attain the age of five years." *Children in English Society, Vol. II--From the Eighteenth Century to the Children Act*, 1948 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973), p. 699.

[39] Historians have yet to examine the subject of death in more depth. A slender volume, *Western Attitudes Toward Death*, by Philippe Aries (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974) points the way.

[40] Naomi Royde Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

[41] Isaac Watts, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

[42] Anne and Jane Taylor, *op. cit.*, xxviii.

[43] *Ibid.*, xiii.

[44] *The Fairchild Family*, pp. 72-73.

[45] Sarah Trimmer, *Instructive Tales* (London: F. C. & J. Rivington, 1821), "Maxims to Promote Piety and Virtue in Children," pp. 254-260.

[46] See Gillian Avery, *op. cit.*, Andrew Truer, *op. cit.*, and Mrs. E. M. Field, *The Child and His Books* (London: Wells Garner, Darton & Co., 1892), and F. J. Harvey Darton, *Children's Books in England: Five Centuries of Social Life* (Cambridge University Press, 1960). Nobody's education is complete without some knowledge of Simon Simple, Polly Pert, Ellen (the naughty girl reclaimed) and Cecilia who blows a trumpet into granny's ear.

[47] This tale is in Mrs. Pilkington's *A Biography for Girls on Moral and Instructive Examples for Young Ladies* (1799) described in Gillian Avery, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

[48] Isaac Watts, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

[49] For instance the famous evangelical preacher, John Newton, the ex-slave trader, confessed himself "a speckled bird among Calvinists" because he was calvinist in his beliefs but curiously Arminian in his preaching. "Though a man does not accord with my views of election, yet if he gives me good evidence that he is effectively called of God, he is my brother: though he seems afraid of the doctrines of final perserverance he is my brother still." *Cardiphonia, or The Utterance of the Heart in a Course of Real Correspondence*, Vol. II (London: J. Johnson & Co., 1812), p. 269.

William Wilberforce was generally Arminian but clung to doctrines of innate depravity usually associated with Calvinism. He said, "Christianity recognizes no innocence or goodness of heart. ' *A Practical View*, p. 367.

Even among missionaries whom one might suspect of Arminian assumptions behind their evangelization there was bitter wrangling. For example, on the first voyage of London missing Society men on "The Duff" in 1796 some men were sent back and not allowed to be missionaries often a better interrogation by their Calvinist brethren during which the unfortunate fellows showed their Arminian tendencies! Richard Lovett, The History of the L.M.S., 2 Vols. (London: Henry Frowde, 1899), pp. 48-49.

[50] *Little Henry and His Bearer* (1814), p. 90.

[51] It is interesting to note that one hundred and sixty one years later much the same argument is used about the Developing World inasmuch as it is said that if countries such as India had the same "values" as the Developed World they would not be idle as they are now. Also the observation made by Mrs. Sherwood in this story that Henry's conversations with Boosy, his bearer, "were better suited than those of an older and more learned person" is still not an uncommon view that people in the Developing World are actually "undeveloped." *Ibid.*, pp. 76 and 116.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 132.

[53] Mrs. Sherwood, *The Flowers of the Forest* (London: Religious Tract Society, 1939).

[54] Noami Roy-Smith deals with Mrs. Sherwood's anti-catholic propagandizing. She points out that her stories *The Nun* and *The Monks of Cimies* (apart from showing that our prim Mrs. Sherwood had read that decadent French novel by Diderot, La Religeuse) were part of a popular anti-catholic bandwagon. *Victoria* is an intricate novel of an anti-catholic theme. The same trend was evident in North America as Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964) shows pp. 345-379.

[55] *The Fairchild Family*, p. 155.

[56] The matter of "innocence" is interesting inasmuch as evangelical literature constantly uses it in relationship to childhood and womanhood. One might suspect sexual innocence is the key to the repetition even though sexuality is dismissed from evangelical consciousness.

[57] Other stories on infant piety by Mrs. Sherwood include *John Marten, Victoria* and *Roxobel*. Two books which discuss the use of the romantic child are Peter Coveney, *The Image of Childhood* (revised edition, Harmondsworth: Peguin Books, 1967) and William Walsh, *The Use of Imagination* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1958). Gillian Avery discusses the "saved child," pp. 81-103.

[58] The matter of drink was always abhorrent in evangelical literature. Later in the century this abhorrence became institutionalized in the Temperance Movement.

[59] See Ivy Pinchbeck and Margaret Hewitt, *op. cit.*, pp. 347-386 and Phillipe Aries, *Centuries of Childhood* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962) and Lloyd deMause (ed.), *The History of Childhood* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1974).

[60] Hannah More, *Coelebs in Search of a Wife, Comprehending Observations on Domestic Habits and Manners*, Religion and Morals (London: T. Cadell & W. Davies, 1813), p. 13. This book creates the "ideal" evangelical man and woman which should result from the "ideal" evangelical child rearing practices.

PROTESTANT VIEWS ON EDUCATION, 1865-1900: A REEVALUATION OF THE DUAL PATTERN OF PARALLEL INSTITUTIONS THESIS

by

Richard Ognibene
Siena College
Loudonville, New York

A survey of the literature of religious education suggests that the field is in a state of crisis. A few practitioners think that realistic future projections should be based upon an understanding of the historical antecedents of the current crisis, and upon the current realities affecting religion and education.[1] However, while efforts to investigate these latter factors have already generated some new formulations,[2] insights resulting from historical study are slower to emerge. It seems clear, for example, that historians engaged in the "recovery of American religious history" have little interest in reexamining religious educational issues.[3] One important unexamined issue is the reaction of American Protestantism to the emerging public school system during the last third of the nineteenth century. It is that issue that this paper will investigate.

Because there has been little research in this area, an erroneous idea exists that "most Protestants saw in the secularization of the public schools no serious threat to religion."[4] A related error is the continued use of a construct that asserts that Protestants accepted the public school because its work could be supplemented by the denominationally controlled Sunday school. Expanding a concept of James Hastings Nichols,[5] Robert Lynn wrote that "the majority of Protestants had become irrevocably committed to the dual pattern, 'this typically Protestant parallelism of the public school and Sunday school.'"[6] The acceptance of public education, Lynn noted, became "an article of faith in the unofficial but operative credo of American Protestantism."[7] According to Lynn, when belief in the public school was coupled with faith in the Sunday school, a model was created which "most Protestants were ready to defend . . . as the American way and the Protestant ideal."[8] This pattern, wrote William Bean Kennedy, "has provided the framework within which the Protestant churches have attempted to work out their particular programs of religious education. From time to time," he continued, "additional programs have been established and old ones modified. But since 1860 there has been no major challenge to that fundamental commitment."[9] Though formulated over a decade ago, this analysis is still accepted by historians of education.[10]

My contention is that the above analysis does not withstand close scrutiny for the period 1865-1900. An examination of Northern Baptist, Episcopalian, and Presbyterian journals, and records of their denominational gatherings suggests a qualified and diverse, rather than a complete and unified Protestant acceptance of public education. These same sources also reveal dissatisfaction with the way the Sunday school actually worked in practice. Similar findings emerge from an analysis of these denominations in Rochester, New York. Such evidence prompts the conclusion that the "dual pattern of parallel institutions" thesis is inaccurate when used to explain Protestant views on education during the late nineteenth century, and hence inadequate as a basis for rethinking current religious educational questions.

A Place for God: Baptist Views of the Academy and the College

In the first half of the nineteenth century, Baptists supported the common school movement, a position they maintained throughout the century.[11] In part, this support was the result of their conviction that Baptist growth did not require an elementary parochial school system.[12] Furthermore, as Barnas Sears pointed out in his opening address to the 1872 National Baptist Educational Convention, there were a number of practical obstacles to the establishment of such a system.[13]

Baptists also accepted the removal of the Bible from the common school. As nineteenth century descendants of Roger Williams, Baptist leaders accepted his views of religious freedom and separation of church and state, and applied the implications of those views to the specific problem of the Bible in the public school.[14] Hence, Alvah Hovey could argue against exempting church property from taxation, against state employment of chaplains, against enforcement of Sabbath laws, and against state support for Bible reading in its schools.[15] For Henry King, Bible reading was a "relic" from the colonial period that posed a danger to the common schools: "better, a thousand times better, the free schools without the Bible than no free schools" was an expression of King's conviction on this question.[16] The Reverend Galusha Anderson succinctly stated the denomination's view when he addressed an 1886 Baptist Congress for the Discussion of Current Questions held in Baltimore. There he expressed doubt that "the perfunctory reading of the Holy Scriptures would do much toward educating the nation in religion. But whether it would do much or little," he argued, "we have no right to do the great evil of violating the conscience in matters of religion that good may come."[17]

At the level of elementary education Baptists accepted the development of the public system, including the secularization that had taken place within that system. That acceptance, however, can be understood only in light of Baptist rejection of the other components of the public system, the high school and the state university, and of Baptist insistence that education at those levels come under denominational auspices.

Baptist enthusiasm for post-elementary religious education was well stated by George Pepper in a centennial reflection offered in 1876:

> We must continue for the next century and for every succeeding century, to do what our fathers of the closing century have done, make our academies and colleges centres of gospel light as well as of general culture, turn upon them distinctly religious influence, put them in charge of godly men . . . and flood them with increasing prayers. Doing this, these institutions will be . . . the safest of all places for our children.[18]

Like his coreligionists, when Pepper thought of religious schools, he thought in terms of the academy and the college. By the last third of the nineteenth century, Baptists had developed a conception of denominational education built upon the metaphor of a pyramid whose base was the Baptist academy. It was Sewall Cutting who in 1871 created the image that stated the Baptist educational problem and the denomination's priority for its future educational work. If, according to Cutting, the educational system was a pyramid, then the "place at which to begin the erection of a pyramid [was] at its base." Mistakenly, Baptists had "attempted to build from the apex." With absolute clarity, Cutting indicated how Baptists envisioned the pyramid's base:

> We want no more theological seminaries, now, nor conceivably within the next hundred years; we want no more colleges at present; . . . we want academies multiplied, with good buildings, good apparatus, and good endowments, . . . accessible universally to our sons and daughters . . . We must have academies, or our whole superstructure must fail and disappoint us.[19]

This theme was so pervasive in Baptist literature that twenty years later Baptist writers still used Cutting's image and language.[20]

Baptist support for the academy was the critical plank in their educational platform. Recognizing the state's obligation to provide elementary education, Baptists maintained that education above that level was not essential to the state's welfare, and that the nature of higher education was necessarily religious. At the very time (1880's) when the number of public high schools surpassed private secondary institutions, Baptists argued that the ideal secondary school should be privately controlled and religiously based.[21] With more hope than the facts permitted, one Baptist academy principal proclaimed in 1891 that "the ardor for public high schools . . . [was] cooling," and he implied that if Baptists worked to improve their academies, they would prevail over the high school.[22]

There was little doubt about the reason for Baptist preference for the denominationally controlled secondary school -- there, religious influences could be pervasive. S. S. Green's address on "Academies" to the National Baptist Education Convention in 1870 stated an opinion that sustained Baptists for decades: "In its *moral* and *religious* sense, the academy should be truly Christian. In this regard it has a decided advantage over the public high school."[23] Education in the academy enabled life's "choicest influences" to be exerted on the young.[24] Not surprisingly, one of those "influences" was Baptist doctrine. The denominational school functioned to "perpetuate and make fruitful those principles which the denomination believes to be vital."[25] Another "choice influence" was the Christian teacher, an inspirational person who would direct students' attention to "the holy life of the Savior." Such a teacher, one academy principal exclaimed, was "the first and chiefest equipment of a Christian Academy."[26]

Just as Baptists expressed a preference for denominational academies to public high schools, so too did they favor Baptist colleges to the newly created state universities. N. S. Burton summarized Baptist sentiments in 1874 when he noted that

> The denominational college having its origin in religious zeal, drawing to it, both as instructors and pupils, a larger proportion of earnest Christians than the state institution, will furnish an atmosphere more favorable to Christian development and training for Christian work.[27]

While Baptist editorials regularly encouraged support for denominational colleges, a speaker before a Baptist Education Society meeting in 1890 succinctly summarized the denomination's fear: "God save us from a university in which virtue is optional and baseball compulsory."[28] Ten years later, another speaker addressing the same body, noted that Baptists had founded one hundred and sixty-six secondary and collegiate institutions between 1850 and 1900, and he exhorted his audience to carry on the work that had "only just begun."[29]

Baptist educational activity increased in intensity during the last third of the nineteenth century. Historians, failing to distinguish their views on elementary, secondary, and collegiate education, have obscured the fact that Baptists rejected a substantial portion of the public educational system. The views and activities of Baptist leaders in Rochester, New York, lend additional support to this conclusion.

In Rochester, Baptists neither called for parochial schools nor opposed the removal of the Bible from the public system. A few months prior to the Rochester school board's resolution prohibiting Bible reading (June 7, 1875), a local newspaper solicited the opinion of a number of Protestant clergymen on this issue. The pastor of the First Baptist Church suggested that the prohibition "would not have any irreligious effect,' an opinion also expressed by the pastor of the Second Baptist Church.[30] After the school board's resolution was passed, an ecumenical ministerial meeting was held which resulted in the drafting of a resolution protesting the board's action. Twenty-four ministers, not a single one of whom was Baptist, signed the protest resolution.[31]

As a denomination, Baptists had achieved considerable strength in Rochester. Fourteen Baptist churches opened between 1818 and 1897, and both the University of Rochester and the Rochester Theological Seminary were founded as Baptist institutions and remained so throughout the nineteenth century. Members of these latter institutions were nearly unanimous in giving intellectual support to the idea of establishing a denominational academy. However, although they were influential members of local churches, especially First or Second Baptist, they were unable to motivate their coreligionists to effective action.

Local Baptist leaders were familiar with and contributed to the debate concerning academies. Augustus H. Strong, President of the Theological Seminary and member of First Baptist Church, argued that "academies, well endowed and properly located . . . constitute one of the great needs." Martin B. Anderson, President of the University and member of Second Baptist Church, replaced the pyramid metaphor with a new one when he made this criticism: "we began to build our educational chimney at the top." Joseph Gilmore, University of Rochester professor and former pastor of Second Baptist Church, contributed another version of the Baptist metaphor: ". . . in our educational enterprises, we began with the cupola and are now getting down to the foundations."[32] In 1883, A. J. Barrett, pastor of Lake Avenue Baptist Church, chaired the education committee at the state Baptist convention. In that capacity, he authored a report urging increased support for the two existing Baptist academies in the state, and exhorted the delegates to continue working "until we shall have under Baptist control, and under direct Baptist influence, a well-endowed academy in every part of the state, within reach of every young man or woman . . . , and free to every such deserving one."[33] According to Barrett, such schools were essential because the Christian "teacher in the academy comes in contact with young men, at . . . the more decisive period of their lives . . . than does the pastor or the college professor."[34]

Although they failed to establish a denominational academy in the city, Rochester Baptists did take some action to promote the academy movement. President Anderson, three University professors, one Seminary professor, and the pastor of First Baptist Church were listed as references in an advertising brochure for the Riverside Seminary which opened in Rochester in 1870. This female academy was opened by Mrs. Sarah Nott, wife of a local Baptist minister. The minister's function, according to the brochure, was to conduct the religious services that would constitute a daily part of school life. The willingness of the University to cooperate with the academy was suggested by a note in the brochure indicating that a teaching vacancy in the Seminary would be filled when the University's Greek professor recommended a suitable candidate. In addition, arrangements had been made for students to use the University's biology facilities and to attend lectures by its chemistry professor.[35] In spite of such support, the academy failed to attract sufficient students and it closed after two years.[36]

Also in 1870, President Anderson served on a committee to establish Cook Academy in Montour Falls, a town located seventy miles southeast of Rochester.[37] Subsequently, Professor Gilmore was appointed to another committee created by the state Baptist Convention to oversee Cook Academy.[38] In the 1880's, the Board of Trustees of the Rochester Theological Seminary began a decade long campaign to create support for a Baptist academy in Rochester.[39] When their resolutions failed to generate the endowment required to begin such an enterprise, the Board began to finance student scholarships at the Marion Collegiate Institute located twenty miles east of Rochester. Although founded in 1855, this academy was not considered an acceptable institution until the mid- 1880's when Baptists attained a majority on its Board of Trustees. In 1893, after it became apparent that distance prevented either Cook Academy or Marion Institute from genuinely satisfying Baptist educational needs in Rochester, the Seminary trustees passed another resolution stating "that the thing essential to the strengthening and completion of our education structure in Rochester [was] the establishment and endowment of a distinctively Christian academy. . . ."[40]

As the century came to a close, Rochester Baptists had accomplished little despite all their talk about religiously based secondary education. Like the four Rochesterians on the Education Committee reporting to the Baptist state convention in 1899, Rochester Baptists knew that "editors, clergymen, teachers, . . . and leaders of the denomination [had] repeated over and over again the same declaration" in favor of academies. Nevertheless, that committee once again concluded that the denominational academy was "never more needed . . . than . . . now" if the church was "to rear its choicest youth . . . to the keenest thinking and supremest living."[41] But for Baptists in Rochester, the age of the academy was over before it began.

Although attempts to establish an academy had failed, local Baptists could take pride in the University of Rochester, where for thirty-six years, President Martin Anderson gave form to the Baptist vision of religious and moral collegiate education. Anderson's experience prior to his university presidency in 1853 were all in Baptist settings. As a licensed Baptist minister, professor in a Baptist college, and editor of a Baptist weekly, Anderson had developed sentiments compatible with the founding idea of the University which he would head. The University's first catalogue (1850) stated that the aim of its faculty was "in connection with the discipline of the intellect, to inculcate a pure morality, and the general truths and duties of evangelical Christianity."[42] In Anderson's view, God was the focal point of the University curriculum: "All instruction unfolding the laws of science, literature and history," Anderson declared, "should be permeated with the warmth and light and glory of the incarnate Redeemer."[43] For Anderson, "the ends of a Christian school . . . ought not to be essentially different from those of a Christian Church."[44] That being the case, Anderson further concluded that he did not think that "the work of a Christian teacher ought to be substantially different from the work of a Christian pastor."[45]

Anderson's ideas about higher Christian education were given life by his conduct at the University. Childless though married for forty-two years, Anderson devoted himself to the moral upbringing of "his boys." "He believed," a former student wrote, "and he made every student believe, that character [was] the greatest thing in education."[46] His biographer, a long-time colleague at the University, thought that Anderson's greatest fame was "as a Christian man whose whole being was alive with zeal to elevate his fellows."[47] That "zeal" was communicated in Anderson's classroom where his teaching always emphasized the religious and ethical side of the question under consideration, in numerous personal interviews with students, and in his "chapel talks" given twice weekly to the student body.[48] In choosing his faculty, Anderson selected like-minded men, generally Baptists, who could assist him in the moral and religious enterprise he defined as higher education.

As a result of Anderson views and his status as Rochester's most prominent Protestant educator, the University retained its identification as a Baptist institution, a condition that Anderson's successor, David Jayne Hill, believed limited its potential growth. Hill's attempt to broaden the University roused the ire of the Board of Trustees and the local Baptist community, and led, finally, to Hill's resignation. In the college, as in the academy, nineteenth century Rochester Baptists expressed a clear educational preference, and that preference was primarily religious.

Reluctant Acceptance; Episcopalians and Public Education

Unlike Baptists, leaders of the Protestant Episcopal Church were quick to express dissatisfaction with the common school, and to suggest an alternative reflecting their Anglican educational heritage. The author of an article appearing in an 1840 issue of the Episcopalian *Journal of Christian Education* wondered why "every parish" did not yet "exhibit the beautiful spectacle of a church and schoolhouse side by side." Shortly thereafter, the journal stated a position it reitereated throughout its brief four year existence:

> We have no expectation of seeing the youth of the Church properly educated, until we have throughout the length and breadth of the land, PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS under the immediate supervision of the pastors of each congregation.[49]

During the 1840's and 1850's, the *Churchman* an Episcopalian weekly, supported Catholic Bishop John Hughes' contention that denominational schools share state educational funds. In the 1850's, the *Church Review*, an Episcopal quarterly, published several articles criticizing the moral deficiencies of public schools. Believing that these deficiencies resulted from the absence of dogmatic instruction in the public system, the journal confessed to "see no remedy but parochial or Church schools."[50]

Throughout this period, the Episcopal General Convention was more restrained than the denominational journals. Although discussing the question informally, the Convention declined to officially support a parochial school system, preferring instead to allow individual dioceses to make their own educational decisions. Nevertheless, at the triennial conventions, a growing number of dioceses reported the existence of parochial schools. Finally, in 1862, after a lay committee, appointed at the preceding convention, independently published a similar recommendation, the General Convention officially recommended the establishment of "parochial schools, as far as practicable, in all our parishes."[51]

It was, however, the General Convention of 1865 that most significantly shaped Episcopalian educational views in the late nineteenth century. At that Convention, the newly created Standing Committee on Christian Education issued a lengthy report that constituted the Convention's educational position for the next thirty-five years. Lacking statistics, the report offered some basic principles that touched upon home education, parochial and Sunday schools, boarding schools, the college, and theological training. The section on parochial schools clearly retreated from the stand taken in 1862, yet showed the Episcopal ambivalence to public education that characterized subsequent denominational discussions.

Although praising the common schools, the report identified the absence of formal religious teaching as those schools' only defect. That deficiency, however, was a serious one, and resulted in the following Committee recommendations:

> All that can be urged upon the whole Church is that her ministers and people will not simply acquiesce in whatever schools may happen to be near them, but conscientiously do their best to provide *Christian* education for the church, [e]ither by opening and supporting parochial schools, [or] by using whatever fair influence they may in the management of the public schools. . . .[52]

The Committee further suggested that Episcopal clergy cooperate with other ministers to devise a "released time" arrangement for the Christian education of those in public schools.

The Committee's report was well received and its chairman, the Reverend John Kerfoot, lauded. An extraordinary motion was passed to have three thousand copies of the report printed and distributed to clergy across the country. In the discussion that followed, Dr. Kerfoot recounted his dilemma in making the recommendations on parochial schools. He told of his preference for "common Episcopalian schools," but thought that the establishmen of such a system was an "utter impossibility." Kerfoot therefore concluded that "if our people are to wait to educate their sons until the Church comes up to her duty in this respect, the generations for the next thirty, sixty, or one hundred years, must go untaught." Since that prospect was unacceptable, Kerfoot felt "bound as a citizen and as a minister of Christ not to stand back in sullen opposition to the public schools, but to do what he [could] to hallow them for Christ and Church."[53]

The Committee on Christian Education began its report in 1868 with the comment that Kerfoot's 1865 recommendation provided so complete a "theory of Christian Education that it left nothing to be added."[54] That analysis proved correct for education reports submitted to the triennial convention for the rest of the century. Thus, in 1868, 1871, 1880 and 1886, Episcopal Conventions received reports urging the support of parochial schools. That the results of these encouragements were minimal was indicated by the 1880 Committee's own evalution: "As yet," that report noted, "it seems not too much to say that very little of systematic effort has been produced by the reports of the Committee, or the deliberations of the General Convention."[55]

Part of the problem was the absence of teachers for the proposed parochial schools. Beginning in 1868, the Committee on Christian Education urged the creation of voluntary associations of Christian men and women to staff these schools -- an idea probably inspired by the teaching sisters who served the Catholic Church. Subsequent reports did not indicate much success with this proposal, a fact that undoubtedly contributed to Episcopal inability to establish a parochial school system.[56]

The call for Episcopalian parochial schools could be heard as late as 1890. The *Church Review* published an address by a layman, Richard Lathers, that exemplified Episcopalian feelings about public education, and expressed that denomination's preference for religious education. Arguing that the increased availability of public education corresponded to an increase in crime and the lessening of "social restraint," Lathers called for a return of the Bible to the public schools, and then proposed splitting state funds among denominational schools according to number of students each school educated. In fact, in the late 1870's, Lathers had once proposed such a sharing of funds to New York's Governor Robinson, a proposal he believed was rejected because the politicans involved desired not to become identified with an action that could be construed as an attack on the public schools.[57] Commenting on the end of the article, Henry Mason Baum, long-time editor of the *Church Review*, "heartily endorsed" Lathers' proposals, and concluded that "the thoughtful and observing [American citizen] long since must have come to the same conclusion." Optimistic in spite of his own denomination's failure, Baum incorrectly predicted that "the day was not distant when the great religious bodies in this country will gather their children into private or parochial schools."[58]

Like Dr. Kerfoot's recommendation on parochial schools, the suggestion that Episcopalians attempt to "influence the management of the public schools' was repeated by subsequent education committees. To remedy what one Episcopalian writing in 1876 termed the "great deficiency' of the common schools,[59] the Education Committee of 1877 reminded members of the General Convention of their "clear duty to leaven those schools with religious influences." The specific "influences" the Committee thought Episcopalians should seek to incorporate into the common schools were Bible reading, the instruction about and student recitation of the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Apostles Creed.[60] Throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century, Episcopalians continued to show concern over the lack of formal religious instruction in the public schools. During this period, however, an increasing number of state and local regulations prohibited activities like those mentioned above. Hence, the Education Committee of 1898 suggested a new tactic to the General Convention. They urged Convention members to vote for public school officials who promised to hire only Christian teachers.[61] This willingness to settle for informal and indirect religious influence was yet another retreat from the Episcopalical conception of an ideally organized educational system.

One Episcopalian historian, Joseph Thayer Addison, declared that the denomination's educational efforts in last third of the nineteenth century consisted of "much talk and little action."[62] That criticism was correct, but it should not obscure the fact that the conversation was also an indication of Episcopalian dissatisfaction with the public school system.

In Rochester, Episcopalian educational preferences mirrored those expressed at the denomination's National Conventions. The city's Episcopal Bishop, Arthur Cleveland Coxe, desired the expansion of the denomination's educational activities at all levels, and worked to alleviate the financial problems of existing Episcopalian schools. He thought parish schools were "grand necessities,"[63] and instructed Episcopalians in the Western New York Diocese to use the common schools only as a last resort. "But where we can do better," Coxe declared, "let us do our full duty to our own children . . . by gathering them into schools and colleges thoroughly Christian."[64] However, Episcopalian efforts to establish parochial schools in Rochester had no permanent results. During the 1830's, St. Luke's Church maintained a charity school that closed after the public school system was reorganized from a district system to city-wide system.[65] In the early 1850's, St. Paul's opened a parochial school, as did the mission church controlled by Christ Church in the late 1860's. Both ventures were short-lived.[66] In 1869, as a result of a four thousand dollar gift from a prominent Rochester businessman, St. Paul's purchased a house near the church and opened it as a school. At first, the school was for girls, then for boys, and finally it was abandoned and turned into a parish residence.[67] Despite that failure, St. Paul's assistant rector, C. N. Allen, remarked to the local press in 1875 that he thought "it necessary to have sectarian schools."[68] Although Allen expressed the sentiment of the Episcopal Clergy, the Diocese of Western New York had fewer parochial schools at the end of the nineteenth century than it did in 1865, a circumstance that caused at least one clergyman to severely criticize Episcopalian congregations.[69]

Rochester's Episcopal clergy were also unhappy about the removal of the Bible from the city's schools. Reverend Allen thought students should read the Bible for the "moral effect" it produced, and he and five colleagues signed the resolution protesting the school board's action.[70] That Bishop Coxe held a similar view was evidenced by his article in the *North American Review* published in 1881. Declaring that America's strength resulted from her Christian tradition, Coxe argued that without continued acceptance of the Bible that strength would soon erode. For Coxe, the demand to eliminate the Bible from the schools was another example of the dangers Catholicism presented to the nation, a theme he had previously articulated in remarks delivered in Rochester several years earlier.[71]

The reports of the General Convention made it clear that Episcopalians preferred denominational schools at the elementary, secondary, and collegiate levels. Nationally, it was at the secondary level that Episcopalians experienced their greatest success. Locally, that success was evident in Rochester in the relationship between St. Luke's Church and the Livingston Park Seminary. Founded in 1858, this female academy became a special concern of St. Luke's rector, Henry Anstice, after his appointment to that church in 1866. The casual affiliation Anstice established with the Seminary in the late 1860's became more formal in 1870 when the school was officially placed under his pastoral care. As a result, the boarding students attended church services as a group, and were enrolled in St. Luke's Sunday School.[72] The Seminary's principal required students to give an oral or written resume of the Sunday sermon, a task she claimed was not difficult because of student affection for Dr. Anstice.[73] Other aspects of the school's religious character were the prayers and hymn that began every school day, and the formal study of "Bible" as a subject in which students were examined and graded.[74] Not surprisingly, Dr. Anstice frequently visited the school, and Bishop Coxe participated in its commencement activities and other special events.[75]

The Episcopal attempt to provide religious education for boys in Rochester was less successful. Reverend Thomas Drumm opened St. Mark's boarding school in 1870, but financial problems forced the school to close six years later.[76]

In June of 1896, a month before his death, a terminally ill Bishop Coxe visited Livingston Park and several other schools in his diocese. Undoubtedly Coxe's visits accomplished very little, except perhaps to remind Episcopalians that the Bishop valued religious schools.[77] In Rochester, however, as elsewhere, the educational desires of Episcopal leaders surpassed the results actually achieved.

The more conservative component of the Presbyterian Church, the Old Side faction, demonstrated its disapproval of the common school movement by organizing a parochial school system between 1846 and 1870. Ultimately, two hundred and sixty-four schools were created, but the system, beset with internal problems, was unable to survive the strains imposed by the Civil War.[78] Yet as late as 1865, the Reverend D J. Waller's Board of Education Report to the Presbyterian General Assembly contained a resolution urging the Assembly to recommend that congregations establish parochial schools.[79] But Waller was fighting a losing battle, for throughout the Presbyterian Church the conviction was growing that the experiment in parochial education had failed. Following the reunion of Old and New Side Presbyterian groups in 1870, the Board of Education was reorganized by the General Assembly "without instructions to maintain the School Department."[80]

Although Presbyterians abandoned their parochial schools, they continued to express a preference for education that was religiously based. One form of that expression was a surprisingly complimentary view of Catholic educational efforts. In 1865, well before the Catholic system was fully developed, the Reverend Thomas McCauley attributed the Catholic Church's progress to its "school power," and he urged the Presbyterian Church to build upon a similar basis.[81] Twelve years later, The Reverend A.A.E. Taylor voiced a similar sentiment and suggested that Presbyterians "may . . . learn some valuable lessons . . . from . . . the Romish Communion, and its unswerving maintenance of the necessity of education under its own control."[82] Mingling compliment with criticism, one Presbyterian argued that eliminating religious practices in public schools "would not satisfy Papists, who obstinately--and correctly were their religion correct--insist that education shall be Christian for their children."[83]

Perhaps the most enthusiastic Presbyterian appraisal of Catholic education came in 1887 from Princeton's distinguished theologian, A. A. Hodge. Hodge so strongly agreed with Catholics concerning the unity of religious ideas with the rest of human knowledge, that he publically expressed his appreciation:

> Shall we not all of us who really believe in God give thanks to Him, that He has preserved 'the Roman Catholic Church in America today true to the theory of education upon which our fathers founded the public schools of the nation,' and from which they have been so madly perverted.[84]

Similar praise came from other Presbyterians into the 1890's.[85]

A more important expression of the Presbyterian preference for an educational system that included religion was the denomination's campaign to retain the Bible in the public schools. An indication of this preference was a resolution of the General Assembly in 1870 stating that the removal of the Bible from the schools would be a "deplorable and suicidal act" and a "moral calamity to the nation."[86] That resolution foreshadowed a theme that dominated Presbyterian educational literature for the next twenty years, namely, that the purpose of education was to promote morality. The establishment of a moral order was the state's chief object, and Presbyterians were certain that the major source of that morality was the Bible. The argument was summarized by a writer in the *Princeton Review*:

> ...all sound morality must have its roots in religion, and the only religion which the mass of our American States know, or can know, is the religion of the Bible. The very object which the state aims at, therefore, in its common schools is defeated by the extrusion of religion and Christianity.[87]

A moral system based on anything other than religious values was inconceivable. "In fact," wrote Robert Dabney, "Americans taken as we find them, who do not get their moral restraints from the Bible, have none."[88] If, as a constant stream of Presbyterians asserted, the Bible was the source of morality, the conclusion was obvious that the state, for its own welfare, and for the well-being of its citizens, should not eliminate that book from its schools.[89] For Presbyterians, education divorced from religion and morality was "shrunken, distorted, and monstrous."[90] Deviation from this viewpoint was dangerous for individual Presbyterians as the well-known Presbyterian lawyer Stanley Matthews discovered, after he defended the Cincinnati school board's 1869 decision to remove the Bible from that city's schools. During the "Bible War" that racked Cincinnati for the next year, Matthews' "Christian Character and reputation" came under such attack that he felt compelled to offer his resignation as elder of his church.[91]

Presbyterians viewed the Bible as "the best instrument of . . . moral culture," and thought its absence from the schools responsible for the increased social strife in the emerging urban, industrial society.[92] Consequently, Presbyterians offered a number of suggestions to make it possible to retain the Bible in the schools. One suggestion was that parents select the version of the Bible their children would read;[93] another was to time religious instruction so that children whose parents objected to it could be absent from school.[94] A further suggestion was to develop a 'released time" arrangement,[95] and one Presbyterian proposed a return to the common principles of Christianity approach.[96] It angered Presbyterians that none of these alternatives satisfied Catholic objections to public education, especially since they viewed continued Catholic opposition as the main obstacle to a religious public school system.

In January, 1890, Presbyterians in Rochester read a prayer published in a local newspaper by the Reverend David Wylie given at a

40

Presbyterian gathering in New York City. Dr. Wylie commented that Presbyterians did not have litanies, but thought they needed one on the school question. He offered the following:

> From a public school system which banishes the Bible, hushes the voice of prayer and closes the mouths of reverent and Christian teachers; from a system which would expunge virtue, truth, morality, God and Christianity from the school books, and forbid all references to such things in the school-room; from a system which would shut and bar the door against Jesus Christ and His teachings; from the spirit of secularism which withers and destroys all it touches; from Godless and atheistic textbooks; from incompetent and irreverent teachers; . . . the good Lord deliver us.[97]

This view was not unfamilar to Rochester's Presbyterians. Their own pastors had voiced similar sentiments.

The 1875 resolution of the board of education to prohibit Bible reading in the schools provided the occasion for Rochester's Presbyterians to speak out on the school question. Many Protestants in Rochester thought the Board's decision was a reaction to the activities of the city's Catholic Bishop, Bernard McQuaid. McQuaid began his nation-wide campaign for "Christian Free Schools" in Rochester pulpits and lecture halls in 1871. In his argument for state support, McQuaid insisted that public schools were unacceptable to Catholics, and he specifically charged that Bible reading made "the schools in Rochester . . . to all intents and purposes Protestant schools."[98] McQuaid was joined in this opposition to Bible reading by Rochester's most prominent Jewish, Universalist and Unitarian religious leaders.[99] Religious objections were not, however, the sole cause of the school board's action. According to Superintendent Ellis' testimony, the resolution against the Bible "was not done at the request or dictation of any religious sect, but was the result of a growing conviction on the part of several members of the board, that the public schools ought to be secularized. . . ."[100]

In the public discussion that preceded the school board's resolution, Presbyterian leaders voiced unanimous opposition to the proposed prohibition. Believing that 'where morality is ignored, ruin must follow," James Shaw, pastor of Brick Presbyterian Church, argued that "the principles of Christian morality should certainly be taught in the public schools, for it is the duty of the state to teach men to be good citizens." Shaw stated that a school system that did not attempt to teach morality would fail, and that he "would shed no tears if it would." Shaw's colleague, Samuel Campbell, pastor of Central Presbyterian Church, added another dimension to the argument. Describing Bible reading as an act of Christian worship, Campbell pointed out that in a Christian nation, Christian worship was allowed in governmental institutions. He thought it strange to single out the school as the only state institution in which Christian worship was prohibited. "Think of it," Campbell implored Rochesterians, "a Christian teacher liable to arrest and imprisonment if he dared to read the twenty-third Psalm and offer a prayer for God's blessing with his school!"[101]

Rochester Presbyterians were the most active opponents of the school board's action. Of the twenty-four ministers who signed the resolution protesting the school board's prohibition, eleven were Presbyterian.[102] The pastor of United Presbyterian Church, J. P. Sankey, preached a sermon describing the prohibition against the Bible as "a great mistake," especially in view of its historic contribution to American law, prosperity and civic virtue. So certain was Sankey that the nation's welfare depended on the Bible, that he indicated a willingness to have the Catholic Bible read in public schools in preference to no Bible at all. Samuel Campbell used his pulpit to criticize the school board's "hasty" decision, and to blame the local press for giving the board the false impression that public opinion favored removing the Bible. Campbell contended that the schools had as great an obligation to make people moral as they did to make them intelligent.[103]

James Shaw continued the Presbyterian attack in the local press. Noting that chapels and religious exercises were still allowed in prisons and reform schools, he facetiously asked if children would not be better off in those institutions rather than in irreligious schools. Shaw's solution to the controversy was to schedule Bible reading before the start of secular studies, allowing parents who objected to keep their children away until the reading was completed.[104]

Presbyterian criticism had no effect in reversing the school board's decision. McQuaid's opposition, and the fact that the resolution against the Bible was introduced by a Jewish member of the school board, was an indication of the board's need to placate the city's diverse religious groups. In addition, Superintendent Ellis was personally opposed to religious practices in the schools. Ellis was a prominent member of the First Baptist Church, and his views on the Bible question were identical to those of his pastor and other Baptist leaders.[105] In part, the board's resolution may have been a victory of Baptist principles over Presbyterian preferences.

The Sunday School: A Brief Note on the "Darker Side"

A survey of the literature pertinent to late nineteenth century Protestant educational thought inevitably provides an opportunity to examine Protestant views on the Sunday school. That literature reveals that much of what contemporary historians have said about the Sunday school is correct. Protestants did view the Sunday school as a nursery to the church, as an agency of mass regeneration, and as a supplement to the common school. But that same literature also reveals substantial dissatisfaction with the Sunday school. This dissatisfaction is generally ignored or minimized in contemporary historical accounts, and it is evidence of this dissatisfaction that this paper will now examine.[106]

Several facets of the Sunday school evoked critical comment. The Sunday school library, for example, was a frequent target of such criticism. Library texts written by individuals with little literary or theological training, were often stylistically inferior and filled with doctrinal errors. A more serious practical criticism of these books was their distorted portrayal of religious life. In much of the literature, the instantaneous conversion of a sinful child resulted in a successful and ostentatiously pious life. Many books were so unrealistic that they inspired ridicule rather than admiration. For one critic, Sunday school books distorted all that was "fresh, and sweet, and graceful in the religious instincts of the young, by imputing to them the unlovely grimaces and most stupid absurdities of adult cant and hypocrisy." To the Sunday school nurtured on such books, that commentator offered his warmest sympathy.[107]

According to the University of Rochester's Joseph Gilmore, the Sunday school's hymns were not much better than its books. Gilmore, author of the well-known hymn "He leadeth me." analyzed a number of songs used in Sunday schools. He found many of these songs filled with "Incomprehensible nonsense," heresy, or blasphemy.[108] For Gilmore, the poor quality of these hymns was a reflection of a more serious problem he labeled "Sunday school sensationalism." To Gilmore, this phrase referred to efforts of Sunday school teachers to amuse or entertain students through popular music, theatrical productions, and the inevitable Sunday school picnic. This emphasis on amusement, combined with teaching that Gilmore characterized as "mere twaddle," prohibited the Sunday school from achieving its "magnificent possibilities."[109]

The "magnificent possibilities" of the Sunday school were contained in the opportunity it presented to explicity teach Scripture in a way never possible in the common school. It was in the Sunday school that Bible lessons could be analyzed, discussed, memorized, and tested. There, the moral implications of the texts could be fully examined, and specific denominational interpretations inculcated. The failure to accomplish those objectives constituted what one commentator called the "darker side" of the Sunday school story.[110]

"What to Teach and How to Teach," the title of an address given by the Reverend J. Stewart of Rochester to a local Baptist Sunday School Association, succinctly summarized the Sunday school's major problems.[111] The development of uniform Sunday school lessons in the 1870's had clearly not solved the curriculum problem for many Protestants involved in Sunday school work. The unending debate over the "scope of effective Sunday school instruction" focused attention on the Scriptural ignorance of students, even after they attended Sunday School for a number of years.[112] This ignorance, thought to result from unsystematic Biblical instruction, caused one Rochester pastor, J. Ross Lynch, to wish for "some consecrated genius . . . who will invent a system of Sunday school lessons which will make dull scholars learn, make indolent scholars work, make unwilling teachers teach, [and]arouse enthusiasm in those who are listless. . . ."[113]

Both Stewart and Lynch had referred to the Sunday school problem that produced the most anxiety, namely, the absence of qualified teachers. Three areas of concern dominated the discussion about teachers: their youthful immaturity; their lack of Biblical knowledge; and their inexperience or inaptitude for teaching.[114] While little could be done about the first problem, the remedy most suggested for the other two was the weekly teachers' meeting. Joseph Gilmore devised a seven day preparation plan for teachers that included the weekly meeting. According to this plan, the teacher would devote one half to one hour per day in preparation for his or her Sunday duties as follows: Monday, memorize the lesson; Tuesday, use reference works to increase understanding of the Scriptural text; Wednesday, consult commentaries to prepare for possible student questions; Thursday, attend a teachers' meeting for further discussion; Friday, prepare the lesson; Saturday, select the best illustration for the lesson; and Sunday, pray for God's blessing of the lesson.[115] At the teachers' meeting, the main business was "to study the lesson," so Gilmore suggested that a leader be appointed to "repress unprofitable discussion."[116] Despite Gilmore's earnest proposal, and despite the suggestions of others urging increased Biblical study, the feeling persisted that the quality of Sunday school instruction was low. The analysis of the Reverend William Taylor, pastor of Rochester's Brick Presbyterian Church was illuminating on this point:

> The whole matter of the religious education of children is in chaos. The Sunday School, speaking generally, is our only response to this immense and unspeakably important demand. It is doing great work, and is one of the strongest bulwarks of religion that we have. But its limitations are obvious. Of systematic instruction, of anything that is worthy to be called an education in religious things, it is almost as barren as the Sahara Desert is in flowers.[117]

The barreness of Sunday school instruction prompted other remedial proposals. One was the request that pastors become more involved in the Sunday school by increasing their involvement in school activities, and by offering church services for children and training sessions for teachers.[118] Another proposal was that the Sunday school copy the public school in its organizational and administrative structure, its insistence on trained teachers, and its use of progressive pedagogy.[119] Nevertheless, at the beginning of the twentieth century, American Protestants heard a critique that religious and secular educators would hear for the next several decades: "The feeling lives and grows that the [Sunday school]not only is imperfect, . . . but is falling far short of that degree of efficiency which . . . should be looked for in an institution of so important [a]professed mission."[120] The twentieth century Sunday school would require, substantial improvement to overcome the following judgment offered by a Baptist pastor from New York City: "The great mass of families have shifted the responsibility of religious training over on the Sunday school. It is an awful thing to contemplate, but it's true."[121]

Conclusion

In view of the preceding analysis, one can question the assertion that the "parallel institutions" concept was an American Protestant educational "ideal." The leadership of the denominations examined expressed serious reservations about the increasingly secular public educational system. The apparent weaknesses of the Sunday school no doubt intensified denominational dissatisfaction with public education. Like Catholics, Protestants rejected the notion of a school system devoid of religious influence. While the consequence of Catholic dissatisfaction was the creation of a parochial school system, the response of Protestant denominations was more diverse. This varied Protestant response most likely contributed to the failure of individual denominations to achieve their specifically preferred educational goals. It is evident that a number of factors contributed to the growth of the public education in the late nineteenth century. Perhaps Protestant acceptance of the public system was more the result of the failure of Protestantism to achieve its educational goals than a reflection of genuine Protestant educational preferences.

For contemporary Protestant religious educators, the findings of this paper offer both hope and despair. Those wishing to return to the good old days will discover that the educational "ideal" thought to exist in the nineteenth century was more a myth than reality. Yet others will find evidence of a deep commitment to an education permeated with religious values. That commitment may sustain Protestants as they face the uncertain future of religious education.

NOTES

[1] John Westerhoff, *Values for Tomorrows's Children: An Alternative Future for Education in the Church*, Philadelphia, 1970.

[2] Gabriel Moran, *Design for Religion*, New York, 1970; and Douglas Walrath, "Funny Things Happen on the Way to the Future; Findings, Forecasts and Suggestions: A Report Prepared for the Albany Synod of the Reformed Church in America," Schenectady, New York, 1975.

[3] Henry May, "The Recovery of American Religious History," *American Historical Review*, LXX (Oct., 1964), 79-92. Examples of recent histories that neglect religious education issues are Martin Marty, *Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America*, New York, 1970; Paul Carter, *The Spiritual Crisis of the Gilded Age*, DeKalb, Illinois, 1971; and Sydney Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People*, New Haven, 1972.

[4] J. Paul Williams, *What Americans Believe and How They Worship*, third edition, New York, 1969, 139-140.

5 James Hastings Nichols, "Religion and Education in a Free Society," in John Cogley, ed., *Religion in America*, New York, 1958, 152.

6 Robert W. Lynn, *Protestants Strategies in Education*, New York, 1964, 14.

7 *Ibid.*, 22.

8 *Ibid.*, 25-26. See also Lynn's *The Big Little School*, New York, 1971, xiii.

9 William Bean Kennedy, *The Shaping of Protestant Education*, New York, 1966, 38.

10 Vincent Lannie, "The Teaching of Values in Public, Sunday and Catholic Schools: An Historical Perspective," *Religious Education*, LXX (March-April, 1975), 119-120.

11 Francis Curran, *The Churches and the Schools: American Protestantism and Popular Education*, Chicago, 1954, 97-117.

12 T. S. Dunaway, "Baptist Principles, Practices, and Polity: Their Soundess Vindicated by their Natural Results and Logual Consequences," *Baptist Quarterly Review*, IV (July, 1882), 287-302.

13 Barnas Sears, "Institutions of Learning Established by Christian Denominations Considered with Reference to Present and Probable Systems of Public Instruction," *Proceedings of the National Baptist Educational Convention*, New York, 1872, 15-16.

14 W. H. Whittsitt, "Position of the Baptists in the History of American Culture," *The Baptist Quarterly*, X (Oct., 1876), 473-474; and Dunaway, *Op. Cit.*, 289-297.

15 Alvah Hovey, "The Religious Basis of Human Government," *The Baptist Quarterly*, VI (Jan., 1872), 43-51; and "The State and Religion," *The Baptist Quarterly* VIII (Jan., 1874), 65-79.

16 Henry King, "The Relation of the Free State to Education," *The Baptist Quarterly*, XI (July, 1877), 344-345.

17 Galusha Anderson, "Religious Instruction in State Education," *Fifth Annual Session of the Baptist Congress for the Discussion of Current Questions*, New York, 1887, 68-69.

18 George D. B. Pepper, "The School and the Church," *The Baptist Quarterly*, X (Jan., 1876), 24.

19 Sewall Cutting, "The National Baptist Education Convention," *The Baptist Quarterly*, V (April, 1871), 226-227.

20 E. L. Tomlinson, "Our Academies," *Baptist Quarterly Review*, XII (Jan., 1890), 21; and D. W. Abercrombie, "The Academy: Its Place in the Educational Scheme," *Third Annual Meeting of the Baptist Education Society*, Chicago, 1891, 41.

21 A. C. Hill, "One View of the Educational Problem," *Baptist Quarterly Review*, XII (July, 1890), 289-290; and B. Puryear, "How Far Should the State Educate?" *Seventh Annual Session of the Baptist Congress for the Discussion of Current Questions*, New York, 1889, 4-15.

22 D. W. Abercrombie, *Op. Cit.*, 41-43.

23 S. S. Greene, "Academies," *Proceedings of the National Baptist Education Convention*, New York, 1870, 14. Italics in original.

24 Barnas Sears, *Op. Cit.*, 20.

25 N. W. Woods, "The True and Proper Attitude of Baptist Institutions of Learning to the Denomination," *Sixth Annual Meeting of the American Baptist Education Society*, New York, 1894, 61-62; see also W. C. Wilkinson, "A Plea for Academies," *Second Annual Meeting of the American Baptist Education Society*, Chicago, 1891, 62-63.

26 D. W. Abercrombie, *Op. Cit.*, 44-45.

27 N. S. Burton, "The Higher Education and the State," *The Baptist Quarterly*, VIII (Oct., 1874), 491.

28 A. C. Dixon, "Higher Christian Education," *Second Annual Meeting of the American Baptist Education Society*, Chicago, 1890, 66; Editorial support for Baptist colleges can be found in *Baptist Quarterly Review* VII (July, 1885), 363; VIII (July, 1886), 388; and IX (Oct., 1887), 510.

29 J. C. Armstrong, "Our Denominational Schools as Factors in Denominational Development During the Century," *Twelfth Annual Meeting of the American Baptist Education Society*, Hot Springs, Arkansas, 1900, 31.

30 *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, February 19, 1875.

31 *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, June 16, 1875.

32 All three quotes are from "The Special Educational Session," *New York Baptist Annual*, 1883, 11-16. The *Annual* is the published proceedings of the yearly New York State Baptist Convention. The proceedings were published a year later so that references to the *Annual* always refer to something said at the convention the year before the date cited in the footnote.

33 "The Special Educational Session," *New York Baptist Annual*, 1884, 21.

34 *Ibid.*, 22.

35 Information about the Riverside Seminary was contained in an eight page brochure about the school dated August 6, 1870 found in the Rochester Historical Society Collection.

36 Blake McKelvey, "Private Educational Enterprise since Mid-Century," *Rochester Historical Society Publications*, VII (1939), 157.

37 *New York Baptist Annual*, 1871, 13-14.

38 *New York Baptist Annual*, 1872, 13.

39 "Board of Trustees Report," *Thirty-Second Annual Report of the New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education*, Rochester, 1883, 22; and "Board of Trustees Report," *Thirty-Fourth Annual Report of the New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education*, Rochester, 1885, 24-25.

40 "Business Meeting," *Forty-Second Annual Report of the New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education*, Rochester, 1893, 14.

41 "Educational Report," *New York Baptist Annual*, 1900, 33-34.

42 *Catalogues of the University of Rochester, 1850-1900*, Archives of the University of Rochester.

43 Martin B. Anderson, "The University of the 19th Century: What It Is and What It Will Cost," in William C. Morey, ed., *Papers and Addresses of Martin B. Anderson*, I, Philadelphia, 1895, 104.

44 *Ibid.*, 81.

45 Martin B. Anderson, MS of a speech given at Denison University, 1875, 16, Anderson Papers, Archives of the University of Rochester.

46 John B. Calvert, *Men Who Have Meant Much to Me*, New York, 1918, 40.

47 Asahel Kendrick, *Martin B. Anderson, LL.D.: A Biography*, Philadelphia, 1895, 204.

48 Merrill Gates, "His Personal Relations with Young Men," in Kendrick, *Op. Cit.*, 235-238: "Two Great Teachers," *Baptist Quarterly Review*, XI (April, 1889), 226-230; and Henry C. Vedder, "Martin Brewer Anderson: An Appreciation," *Baptist Quarterly Review* XII (April, 1890), 206-207.

49 Both quotes are cited in Francis Curran, *Op. Cit.*, 20-21. Italics in original.

50 *Ibid.*, 22-28.

51 *Ibid.*, 29-30.

52 *Protestant Episcopal Church: The Debates and Proceedings of the General Triennial Convention*, 1865, 271. Subsequent references to Episcopal conventions will be cited as *General Convention* with the appropriate year.

53 *Ibid.*, 275.

54 *General Convention*, 1868, 440.

55 *General Convention*, 1880, 436.

56 *General Convention*, 1868, 442. Convention held in 1871, 1877, 1880, and 1883 also called for voluntary teaching associations.

57 Richard Lathers, "The Duty of Churchmen to the State," *Church Review*, LIX (Oct., 1890), 254-263.

58 *Ibid.*, 266.

59 E. B. Boggs, "The Church and the Nation," *Church Review*, XXVIII (Oct., 1876), 629.

60 *General Convention*, 1877, 520-521; also *General Convention*, 1871, 587.

61 *General Convention*, 1898, 493.

62 Joseph Thayer Addison, *The Episcopal Church in the United States: 1789-1931*, New York, 1951, 219.

63 *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, August 20, 1869.

64 Cited in Roman Catholic Bishop Bernard McQuaid's "Religion in Schools," *North American Review*, April, 1881, reprinted in McQuaids' *Christian Free Schools*, Rochester, N.Y., 1892, 134.

65 R. Bethel Claxton, *Parish Memories of Forty Years: An Anniversary Discourse in St. Luke's Church*, Rochester, N.Y., 1860, 14.

66 Charles Wells Hayes, *The Diocese of Western New York: History and Recollections*, Geneva, New York, 1904, 221; and Henry Anstice, *Annals of St. Luke's Church*, Rochester, N.Y., 1883, 123-124, 138.

67 *St. Paul's Church Centennial: 1827-1927*, Rochester, N.Y., 1927, 23.

68 *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, Feb. 19, 1875.

69 Hayes, *Op. Cit.*, 221-222, 313.

70 *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, Feb. 19, 1875: and *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, June 16, 1875.

71 Arthur Cleveland Coxe, "Theology in the Public Schools," *North American Review*, CCXCII (March, 1881), 211-222; For Coxe's anti–Catholic comments made in Rochester, see Frederick Zwierlein, *Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid II*, Rochester, N.Y., 1926, 41-47.

72 Henry Anstice, *Centennial Annals of St. Luke's Church, 1817-1917*, Rochester, N.Y., 1917, 84.

73 *Livingston Park Seminary: The Story of Sixty Years*, Rochester, N.Y., 1918, 29.

74 Virginia Jeffrey Smith, *St. Luke's Church, Genesee Falls: Past and Future*, Rochester, N.Y., 1967, 59; and Report of Scholarship of Miss Libbi Garbutt, June 16, 1870, Library of the Rochester Museum, Rochester, N.Y.

75 *Livingston Park Seminary*, 29, 47, 58; and Anstice, *Centennial Annals*, 84.

76 McKelvey, *Op. Cit.*, 162.

77 Hayes, *Op. Cit.*, 364-366.

78 Lewis Joseph Sherrill, *Presbyterian Parochial Schools, 1846-1870*, New Haven, 1932.

79 "The General Assembly," *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, XXXVII (Jan., 1865), 474.

80 Sherrill, *Op. Cit.*, 68.

81 "The General Assembly," *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, XXXVII (July, 1865), 477.

82 A.A.E. Taylor, "Presbyterian Colleges as Related to the Growth of our Ministry," *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review*, New Series, No. 21 (Jan., 1877), 144.

83 Robert Dabney, "Secularized Education," *The Princeton Review*, Fifty-Fifth Year (Sept., 1879), 394.

84 A. A. Hodge, "Religion in the Public Schools," *The New Princeton Review*, 62nd year (Jan., 1887), 33.

85 Edward Bromfield, "The Sabbath-School Movement of To-Day," *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, No. 18 (April, 1894), 213.

86 "The General Assembly," *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, XLII (July, 1870), 427.

87 "Recent Publications on the School Question," *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, XLII (April, 1870), 320.

88 Robert Dabney, "Secularized Education," Secularized Education." *The Princeton Review*, Fifty-Fifth Year (Sept., 1879), 388.

89 In addition to the articles cited in footnotes 87 and 88, see also Lyman Atwater, "The State in Relation to Morality, Religion and Education," *The Princeton Review*, Fifty-Fourth Year (March, 1878), 397; Charles Knox, "Problems for Educated Minds in America in the New Century," *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review*, New Series, No. 22 (April, 1877), 213; and David Wylie, "Three Views of the Public School Question," *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, No. 3 (July, 1890), 473.

90 "Recent Publications on the School Question," *Op. Cit.*, 321.

91 Harold Helfman, "The Cincinnati 'Bible Way' 1869-1870," *Ohio Historical Quarterly*, LX (1951), 382.

92 D. H. Mac Vicar, "Romanism in Canada," *The Presbyterian Review*, No. 27 (July, 1886), 438; and his "Social Discontent," *The Presbyterian Review*, No. 30 (April, 1887), 262-281.

93 "Recent Publications on the School Questions," *Op. Cit.*, 324; and Lyman Atwater, "Civil Government and Religion," *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review*, New Series, No. 18 (April, 1876), 229.

94 Atwater, "The State in Relation to Morality, Religion, and Education, *Op. Cit.*, 417.

95 *Ibid.*, 419; and "Recent Publications on the School Question," *Op. Cit.*, 324.

96 Wylie, *Op. Cit.*, 470.

97 *Rochester Post-Express*, January 15, 1890.

98 Bernard McQuaid, *Op. Cit.*, 45.

99 *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, Feb. 19, 1875.

100 A. A. Ellis, "A Brief History of the Public Schools of the City of Rochester," *Publications of the Rochester Historical Society*, Rochester, New York, 1892, 82.

101 Shaw and Campbell are quoted in the *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, Feb. 19, 1875.

102 *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, June 16, 1875.

103 Both sermons are quoted in the *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, June 21, 1875.

104 *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, July 6, 1875.

105 Ellis' views are quoted at length in Zwierlein, *Op. Cit.*, 143-145. Compare these statements with those of his pastor, C. J. Baldwin in the *Democrat and Chronicle* articles of Feb. 19, 1875, and June 21, 1875.

106 Lynn, *The Big Little School*; Lannie, *Op. Cit.*, and John Westerhoff, "A Future for the Sunday School," *Duke Divinity School Review*, 40 (Fall, 1975), 183-201.

107 George Dean, "Sunday School Books," *Church Reviews*, XXVIII (Jan., 1876), 129; also Sanford Cobb, "Sunday School Libraries," *Princeton Review*, XLIII (July, 1871) 369-382; and Mancius Hutton, "The American Sunday School," *The Presbyterian Review*, No. 38 (April, 1889), 188-191.

108 Joseph Gilmore, "The Incidental Evils Again," undated newspaper clipping from the Baptist *Examiner*, Gilmore Scrapbook, Gilmore Papers, Archives of the University of Rochester.

109 Joseph Gilmore, "Report of the Sunday School Committee," *New York Baptist Annual*, 1878, 7-9: and W.H.S. Demarest, "Reconstruction in the Sunday School," *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, No. 45 (Jan., 1901), 137-138.

110 The phase is taken from Rochester Theological Seminary Professor Howard Osgood's "Report of the Special Sunday School Committee," *New York Baptist Annual*, 1891, 22.

111 *Minutes of the Monroe Baptist Association*, 1887, 9. The Monroe Baptist Association was made up of Baptist churches from Rochester and its surrounding towns.

112 George Clark, "Scope of Effective Sunday School Instruction," *Baptist Quarterly*, XI (Oct., 1877), 490-498.

113 J. Ross Lynch, "Relative Merits of Competing Sunday School Systems," *Minutes of the Monroe Baptist Association*, 1893, 11; also Paul Ziegler, "The Sunday School," *Church Review*, LIV (July 1889), 36; Hutton, *Op. Cit.*, 184-185; and Demarest, *Op. Cit.*, 132-133.

114 The twenty-one articles on the Sunday school published in the *Church Review*, LIV (July, 1889), provide a good overview of Sunday school problems, including those involving the Sunday school teachers.

115 Joseph Gilmore, "The Teachers Thorough Preparation," undated newspaper clipping from the Baptist *Examiner*, Gilmore Scrapbook, Gilmore Papers, Archives of the University of Rochester.

116 Joseph Gilmore, "The Teachers' Meeting," undated newspaper clipping from the Baptist *Examiner*, Gilmore Scrapbook, Gilmore Papers, Archives of the University of Rochester. Italics in original.

117 William Taylor, "The Church and the Nation: A Thanksgiving Sermon at the Union Service of the West Side Presbyterian Churches of Rochester, November 28, 1901," Library of the Rochester Museum, Rochester, New York.

118 George Mott, "The Sunday School, Its Past and Present," *The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review*, New Series, No. 7 (July, 1873), 422-426; George Hodge, "The clergy and the Sunday School, and the Sunday School and Church," *Church Review*, LIV (July, 1889), 40-44.

119 Henry Satterlee, "How the Church May Retain Her Hold upon Young Men after They Emerge from the Sunday School," *Church Review*, LV (Oct., 1889), 188; George Forbes, "What Shall We Study in the Sunday School," *Minutes of the Monroe Baptist Association*, 1892, 19-20.

120 Demarest, *Op. Cit.*, 129.

121 "The Special Sunday School Session," *New York Baptist Annual*, 1885, 29.

"THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, 1903."*

Helen A. Archibald
Emory and Henry College
Emory, Virginia 24327

Twenty-five years later one of the participants remembered the national conference on religious education in February, 1903 as an assembly of educational demi-gods. "Never," announced James B. Angell, president of the University of Michigan, who presided over the six sessions of the convention "has there been a gathering with higher and nobler aims than these." According to the call issued by William Rainey Harper, the purpose of the convention was to improve the religious and moral instruction of American youth, an instruction seen as woefully inadequate and imperfectly correlated with the new learning in history, literature, and the sciences. It was Harper's imperial mind, ranging in educational interest from the Chautauqua liberal arts program to the creation of a university center of graduate studies, from his scholarly publications in the Hebrew Old Testament to his teaching in the Hyde Park Baptist Sunday School, which conceived the idea of such a gathering and planned the program enlisting the talents of college presidents, deans, scholars, and ministers. As he brought Baptist piety and secular learning together to create the great University of Chicago eleven years before, he sought in this convention to bring together scholars, educators, and churchmen who could create new educational patterns for the local church school, the public school, the college, and the home.[1]

The four hundred participants, almost without exception, white, male, Anglo-Saxon Protestants,[2] joined in hymn and prayer before hearing the first evening's papers on the next steps in religious education. In his opening address Angell stressed that those present were already persuaded that psychological and pedagogical studies had contibuted much to secular education and that the time had come to permit these studies to transform religious education as well. Intellectual advances in nearly every field had made thoughtful people aware that the new century was to be a time of transition. Although, as Angell noted judiciously, every period is a time of transition, the present transitional crisis was more portentous for religious education than any in nearly a century.

It was not merely that the new learning, emanating from the great universities like those over which Angell and Harper presided, was challenging the conventional and popular pieties of the Sunday School. It was the whole configuration of educational institutions which Protestants had put together at the beginning of the nineteenth century which was being challenged by the literary and historical criticism of the Bible. After the Revolutionary War, and following the period of state disestablishment of churches, Protestants sought to find new forms for transmitting their religious faith across the generations. From 1805 to 1830 Protestants created a distinctive pattern of education. It was composed of institutions which had clear historical antecedents, but in their interrelationships and in the way they functioned in the broader American society of the nineteenth century they represented something genuinely new in the history of education. The configuration included an American version of the English charity school, the Sunday School; the denominational college, narrower in sponsorship and aim than the colonial college; the truly innovative institution, the Protestant seminary, of which Andover (1818) was the pioneer; and the home.[3] The common school crusade of this same period, led by Protestant churchmen and lay reformers, won popular support for state supported and supervised public schools which were looked upon as a part of this larger educational ecology.[4] The public schools were given the responsibility for teaching the common core of Protestant doctrine and morality; the denominational college and seminary provided the instruction in what was distinctive in the variant Protestant traditions; and the home carried the chief responsibility for nurturing the sentiment and will on which all character was thought to be based. The Bible, the accepted standard of authority for all Protestants, was the key to religious training in all these institutions, the home, the school, the college, and the seminary. In a celebrated case in Cincinnati in 1869 a group of laymen sought to restrain the Board of Education from ordering public schools to desist from the practice of daily Bible reading. Judge Alonzo Taft in his decision upholding the Board's action argued that, however seemingly innocuous, the practice of daily Bible reading which almost universally opened the school day was a highly symbolic act. Judge Taft argued that the practice was a form of Protestant worship and as long as it remained the schools had the aura of Protestant parochial schools. Repeatedly non-Protestant parents called upon the courts to secure some relief from this form of Protestant worship so deeply embedded in the "non-sectarian" piety of the public schools.[5]

What Harper, Angell, and the distinguished company gathered in the Chicago Auditorium Hotel on February 10, 1903, perceived was that the traditional Bible, understood as the very word of God to men, the center of Protestant religious authority and the source of Protestant piety, was disappearing from the world of Protestant scholarship. The dogmatic Bible, increasingly being banned from the public schools, was also being challenged at the seminary level by the assured results of more than a half century of German higher criticism of the Bible. Harper, a renowned Hebrew scholar, had himself brought the new textual critical study of the Bible to Yale Divinity School in 1886. He had, too, a remarkable gift for popularization and in his Bible study guides for the laity he sought to deflect interest from what the higher critics had taken away--Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, a relatively smaller matter; and the inerrancy of the scriptures as a whole based on divine authorship throughout, a much greater matter--by drawing attention to what they had established. He shared the conviction expressed by Rush Rhees, president of the University of Rochester, that whatever theories of Biblical revelation were undermined by modern textual and historical criticism of the Bible, the *fact* that the Bible had survived because it inspired was established beyond all doubt.[6] Shailer Mathews, a theologian brought to the Divinity School of the University of Chicago by Harper, recalled years later that Harper had been motivated to convene the 1903 conference by the actual problems he encountered teaching in the Hyde Park Baptist Sunday School; but his service on the Chicago Board of Education, as well as his scholarly interest in transforming Biblical study in both seminary and college, may also have contributed to his motivation.[7]

Harper proposed the idea of a national conference on religious education the previous year to a learned society of biblical scholars, the Council of Seventy, which he organized in 1895. The Council took its name from the old tradition that seventy Jewish scholars, each working independently, produced an identical Greek text of the Hebrew Old Testament in the third century B.C. Its purposes were to promote the historical, philological, and comparative study of the Bible in the light of other ancient literatures. In October, 1902, the Council appointed a general committee to plan for the national convention on religious education composed of Harper, Shailer Mathews, and George L. Robinson of Chicago's McCormick Seminary. Chairman of the Program Committee as well, Harper revealed his famed organizational talent by associating with the convention, which he hoped would result in a permanent national organization, the educational luminaries, Nicholas Murray Butler[8] and James B. Angell. Also serving on the Program Committee were Josiah Strong, who, since the publication of his book *Our Country* in 1885,[9] was a persistent though conservative advocate for the social interpretation of Christianity, and Samuel T. Dutton, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia. Frank McMurray, also of Teachers College, served on a three member Invitations Committee. McMurray, one of the founders of the National Herbartian Society, participated the year before in the reorganization of the Society into the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education. He also established an experimental Sunday School at Teachers College on the plea of faculty parents that they wanted a religious education for their children analogous intellectually to the weekday education they were receiving at the College's laboratory school.[10] Albion W. Small, professor of sociology at the University of Chicago, and Philip S. Moxom, a pastor with a long interest in education, were the two other members.[11]

George Albert Coe, who held the John Evans professorship in moral and intellectual philosophy at Northwestern, served on the

Arrangements Committee. Coe, just past forty, was moving steadily in his professional interests from philosophy in which he received his Ph.D. in 1891 to experimental psychology, and was ready in the winter of 1903 to turn the corner into a new career as an educationist. Young in terms of this new interest, Coe would grow old with the Religious Education Association organized in the conference's last session, living almost to the eve of its fiftieth anniversary.

Many of participants in the conference were to achieve careers that won them a permanent place in American social history. John Dewey, already in his mid-forties, with the epochal *Studies in Logical Theory* completed, yet, like Coe, still only at less than mid-point in a long life, was to become the most famous.[12] But in addition to those mentioned earlier, the names of many of the original members of the Association were to become familiar in American educational and religious history. In any account of the religious history of the era the names of Edward S. Ames, Irving King, Edward Diller Starbuck, and Graham Taylor would figure;[13] and the names of Frederick Eby, Herman Harrell Horne and James E. Russell are familiar to the student of American educational history.[14] George Albert Coe's scholarly work in the psychology of religion kept him in close touch with Ames and Starbuck throughout his career. Nearly forty years later Coe and Starbuck wrote autobiographical essays for a volume entitled *Religion in Transition*[15] and Coe attended the dinner marking Ames' retirement from the Department of Philosophy at the University of Chicago in 1940. Although not finally to achieve equal recognition in the social history of the period, Coe moved as a man of equal interests and achievements among the others at the three day conference. His studies of conversion had been quoted by William James in his 1901-02 Gifford Lectures on "the varieties of religious experience"; and his contributions to the scientific study of the psychology of religion were then equal to those of Starbuck, Ames, and King.[16]

Following the hymn, "When Morning Gilds the Skies," at the opening of the second session of the conference, Coe, Dewey, and Starbuck gave their addresses on "the modern conception of education." Coe and Starbuck graced religious education as a part of general education noting that traditionally all education had been controlled by a religious conception of the aims of human life. The distinctively modern differentiation between religion and education emerged when the nation state became the sponsor of an education conceived as the universal right of all, a process which Coe would elaborate in *Education for Citizenship* thirty years later.[17] Following their addresses, Dewey spoke on religious education as conditioned by the principles of modern psychology and pedagogy.

For Coe, this association with Dewey was to be the beginning of a life-long intellectual companionship although there is no evidence that they ever knew each other personally.[18] Coe acknowledged in many of his writings his indebtedness to Dewey's thought and rejoiced publicly when Dewey's *A Common Faith* (1934) gave him grounds for his conviction that even Dewey's mature instrumentalism did not preclude recognition of the religious as an enduring aspect of human experience.[19] But while for Coe the conference marked a life-long commitment to religious education within the context of the historic church and under the conditions imposed by modern science and democracy, for Dewey it seems to mark as clearly a final turning away from all institutional religion and any education conducted under its sponsorship.[20]

In this address Dewey observed that modern psychology has no special revelations of its own to deliver to religious educators, but it can help interpret and illuminate certain general considerations. Modern psychological theory stresses the principle of growth and the consequent successive expansions of experience at different levels. The child with his own distinctive emotional and mental outlook must be helped to experience the truly religious aspects of his own growing life. The most serious handicap to religious education is the assertion that the spiritual and emotional experience of adults is the appropriate norm for the child's religious life. He advised religious educators to return to Jesus' teaching of the successive stages of growth--first the seed, then the blade, finally the ripening ear of corn. He ended his paper with the observation that the most fundamental of all educational questions concerns the moral and religious growth of persons.

Dewey was as ready as any of the participants in the conference to use Biblical phrases--learned long before in the context of a gospel of crisis and redemption--to underscore the contemporary principle of continuity. Nearly all those who addressed the conference were men who had received their education in the eighties, and, to use Dewey's phrase, the impact of Darwin on their thought was deep and lasting.[21] In one way or another each of the speakers emphasized continuity between man and nature and continuity throughout the physical, mental, and moral growth of persons. But, despite this similarity, Dewey's remarks have a certain *pro forma* quality about them which distinguishes them from the enthusiastic addresses of the other speakers. His words suggest that he had inwardly withdrawn from the ideal which animated Harper and the conference which he had brought into being. How far he was beginning to move from the purposes of the conference and from his own preoccupations when he wrote, "The Obligation to the Knowledge of God," in 1884[22] is seen in an article he published in 1908, to be discussed below, in which he wrote of the problems of religious educators as an interested but detached observer.

Harper, an indefatigable textbook writer, anticipated that the conference addressed would be what he called "a great textbook for the world." Read now, these addresses make clear that the conference as a whole was designed to establish the possibility that the Protestant educational configuration could survive into the twentieth century by means of the very scientific scholarship which threatened to destroy it. Harper had frequently participated in Methodist Bishop John Vincent's extraordinarily successful attempt to transform camp meeting fervor into educational channels through summer institutes at Lake Chautauqua.[23] The February, 1903, gathering--perhaps significantly not in a summer setting of outdoor beauty, but in the urban mid-winter--can be seen as an attempt to do the reverse: to enkindle the new disciplines of psychology and pedagogy with evangelical purpose. The representatives of the educational establishment gather at Chicago saw clearly that the transformation of the dogmatic Bible into the historical Bible of later nineteenth century scholarship created an educational crisis which threatened the infrastructure of the whole educational system.[24] Members of mainline Protestant denominations, confident that their faith complemented modern advances in science and society rather than opposing them, they were seeking some new infallible standard of their own to give stability in the contemporary educational situation.

Underlying all that was said at the conference is the key question of whether or not educational institutions could still transmit the Protestant type. However much scope educational institutions may give to individuals, most theorists from Plato to Durkheim have agreed that they function in society in such a way as to transmit a preferred type.[25] Education, as Werner Jaeger in his seminal study of classical education emphasized, is the direct expression of the educating group's standard. Jaeger's work has given renewed currency to the Greek word, *paideia*: the unifying standard that inhered in Greek civilization and informed its education.[26] Educational historians have increasingly adopted the term to express the unity in American educational institutions despite the salience of the principle of local autonomy which suggests to many that the schools of the nation respond to distincitve community standards and options. But, taken as a whole, the remarkable thing about American education is its homogeneity. There is a national standard operating in American education reflected in the national school ritual of the flag salute and in nationally produced and marketed textbooks. These, in turn, however, reflect a more subtle standard of the character type which the education is designed to reproduce. From the perspective of the last third of the twentieth century it seems clear that the American educational configuration of the nineteenth century served to transmit an idealized Protestant type.[27] Those who accepted Harper's invitation to attend the 1903 conference probably came because they were struggling to find way of vitalizing the process by which that type was created.

They would go in many different directions as they sought an accommodation among the schools, the Protestant tradition, and the ever more clearly emerging secular culture. Some like Josiah Strong, moved closer and closer to a bigoted faith that defined Americanism in terms of Protestantism;[28] others, like Edward S. Ames, sought a naturalistic basis for religion that would universalize their latent Protestantism; only a few followed Dewey in a radical rejection of all metaphysical values. This study will focus only incidentally on the great variety of ways in which the original members of the Religious Education Assocation developed intellectually. If their pilgrimage could be recounted in all its intricate detail, it would illuminate the many routes along which Protestants moved as they let go or sought to retain a hold on the public school.

It was their recognition of the inevitability of having to let go of the public school and the college from the ecology of Protestant educational institutions which explains the fervent devotion to the Sunday School of Harper and so many others at the conference. Under the intellectual and social conditions of the new century, the Sunday School would have to become a true school if it were to do the work which was now thrust upon it. George Albert Coe responded directly to this challenge to professionalize the church's education and make it the equal--his critics would later say, identical to--the best in the new secular education. As the leading theorist of the religious education movement over the next forty years, he is representative of all those who in 1903 were willing to permit standards emerging from within the culture to reshape the church's own patterns of nurture, and even, the church's message itself. After all, as a United States Commissioner of Education put it in 1907, was not the best in American culture a kind of "overflow Christianity"? In letting the best in that culture guide him, Coe testified that he saw this best as perfectly compatible with his Protestant faith.[29] During the next two and a half decades of his life Coe redefined the educational mission of the Protestant church. In a long retirement that lasted another quarter century, he defended that mission against attacks that came from a more aggressively secular society that the gentlemen of 1903 could have imagined and from a renascent orthodoxy within the circles of religious liberalism which they could only with equal difficulty have surmised.[30]

In the winter of 1903, however, all this was still in the future and at the conference Coe was among colleagues, who, drawing their inspiration from many sources, were then united in the conviction that they were lauching a movement whose time had come. Coe summed up his understanding of the intellectual sources which contributed to this unity of outlook of the majority in a paper "The Philosophy of the Movement for Religious Education," published in 1904.[31] Far from casting a backward glance at the Egypt of the old educational configuration, Coe saw the religious education movement with which he had already identified himself as irrepressible in its creative potential for establishing a new *paideia*. It is significant that never once in the essay did he refer to Protestantism directly; the WASP consciousness was still dominant enough, perhaps, not to draw attention to itself. In the introduction to his first book, *The Spiritual Life* (1900), Coe identified the new in contemporary religion as having grown out of evangelicalism; in 1904 he identified the Christian faith, already stripped of all dogma, as only one component of religious education. The essay is clear expression of his personalistic idealism merged with an evolutionary naturalism and moving toward a still nascent pragmatism.

Coe interpreted the philosophy of the movement for religious education as growing out of psychological, sociological, and philosophical assumptions controlled by the principle of evolution and an immanental-personalist theology which was fully compatible with the same principle. These great intellectual themes always fascinated him more than the practical aspects of religious nurture and he elaborated them in his major books, *The Psychology of Religion* (1917), *Motive of Men* (1928), and in his last book, *What is Religion Doing to our Consciences?* (1943). Detailed attention to his mature development of these themes will be given in later chapters of this study, but at this point a summary of his essay will be suggestive of the intellectual climate in which the religious education movement was born. Accepting the radical implications of evolution for the religious life, Coe emphasized that in a real sense "the religious life of each of us is continuous with nature as a whole." Over a long career Coe would abandon some key beliefs of this 1904 essay, but the principle of continuity was to be the intellectual touchstone of his life. However much the piety of the Methodist home in which he was reared evaporated in what he called "the sunlight of my most critical intelligence," the vision of the organic unity of nature and man, the unbroken natural development from the physical to the mental to the religious never dimmed.[32]

Coe first drew attention in his essay to the teleological view of the world which the educational process itself implied. Since in education, nature in the form of the human mind takes conscious control of herself, he concluded that "education defined as a conscious carrying forward of a natural process includes man's will, the will to educate, within the concept of nature."[33] The purposes, or what Coe later liked to call "the wants," of the human mind are responsible for the future direction of the evolutionary process, particularly so for the future direction of social evolution. Although Coe did not refer to Frank Lester Ward, he made a distinction similar to that made by Ward between genetic and telic evolution in tracing the impact of Darwinism on social thought.[34] Here at the point where he linked social evolution as a conscious process with education lies the root of Coe's later educational radicalism. The conviction that education is to reconstruct society and religious education to reconstruct religion would grow only more insistent over the years.

Secondly, he saw the new philosophy of education as rooted in metaphysical idealism. Only a theory of knowledge based on an idealistic ontology could fuse together nature, culture, and society, a fusion which Coe defined as the essential feature of the new pedagogy. The immanence of God was the third foundation of the movement, for once accepted, it removed the opposition between education and grace, growth and conversion. Belief in the immanence of God transformed the theory of evolution from a threat to religious certainties to a luminous description of how the divine works in and through all things. Laws of nature become the orderly methods of a rational will in complete control of itself; and from the perspective of an immanentalist theology, "there is not break in nature when man, a self conscious and moral being, appears." From this perspective education is not merely a device of man; "it is a divine operation in men."[35]

The psychological point of view in religious education was also influenced by the theory of evolution. "Any separation," he wrote, "between religion and other consciousness, religious and other development is in principle impossible to modern thought."[36] Coe followed G. Stanley Hall, "the American Darwin of the mind," in emphasizing the importance of instincts for all mental functions.[37] The continuity of man's mind with mind in lower animal life gave increased power to the theory of instincts and also plausibility to the recapitulation theory which Hall also popularized. As late as his *Psychology of Religion*, published in 1916,[38] Coe still taught a theory of instincts although sometime after 1910 he abandoned Hall's recapitulation theory.[39] But in 1904 Coe accepted the idea that children in their psychial growth "re-traverse the path from animality to spirituality"; moving in their childhood through the cultural epochs of their race even, as was then thought, the embryo recapitulated the stages of organic evolution. Coe interpreted this theory in a way that mediated between the opposing doctrines that the child is naturally good and preternaturally depraved. The teaching of depravity pointed to the truth that there is always something in oneself to overcome; the opposite theory emphasized the truth that it is the self that has the impulse to overcome. Coe welcomed the current emphasis upon instincts as salutary. Western psychology, he noted, had been dominated too long by a Thomistic intellectualism which robbed the mind of vital impulses.

"The newer ethics" which "expresses all ethical conceptions whatsoever in terms of human society" was the fifth foundation of the religious education movement. In its more radical form this ethic asserted that

> Society originated under the law of natural selection; that conscience is entirely accounted for by the pressure of the social will upon the individual; that the only ethical good is social health, progress, etc.; and that the only sanctions of morality are social rewards and penalties.[40]

Coe believed, however, that social sanctions were insufficient to develop ethical character to its fullest. Even enthusiasm for humanity was no more than a "fad or a reaction from the *ennui* of egoism," unless it was suffused with some realization of the "spiritual movement of the universe . . . the eternal in the temporal, God in us."[41]

The philosophy of religion, which since Schleiermacher applied psychological method to both the history and metaphysics of religion, was a sixth contributory to the religious education movement. Coe noted that "the tribe destitute of religion" has never been found and that the history of religion begins with the religious impulse of men as a *datum*. Further, religion always includes within itself an educational process and this process is always modifying the religion out of which it grew. Any enlargement in the cognitive, ethical, or esthetical powers "enlarges the divine."[42] Given this interpretation, reinforced by the teaching of metaphysical idealism that all mental functions are performed under a supreme mind, Coe could confidently declare that any cultivation of persons brings them closer to the divine presence.

Lastly, Coe considered the continuity between the religious education movement and the philosophy of Christianity. The foundation of all educational method was the capacity of sharing life between older and younger; and Christianity, he concluded, was just such a sharing of life since it represented the savior, "who gave his life for many," as a teacher.[43]

Two themes significant for Coe's later thought are not explicitly touched upon in the essay. Science, in the form of biological evolution, does, of course, figure prominently; but science in its most general sense as method–what Coe would later call "the democracy of the intellect"–is absent. Absent, too, is the concept of democracy, a concept which Coe would later socialize and spiritualize so as to make it almost synonymous with Christianity. That such general themes were already much in the air and, indeed, constituted the new century's "climate of opinion," is revealed in an address delivered to a session of the Religious Education Association held in conjunction with a session of the National Educational Association in 1907. Since the speaker was the then Commissioner of Education, Elmer Ellsworth Brown, we can assume that before such an assembled group he developed themes with which he believed they were already familiar and toward which they were generally sympathetic.

He began by noting that the methods employed in education must always follow upon and complement the interests of the wider society. In the middle ages institutional religion dominated society and its methods controlled education; but the "centralizing and unifying fact of modern civilization," Brown told the nation's teachers, "is science, a science which is the same the world over."[44] Contrasted with this universal science, the parochialism of religion, split as it was into many competing sects, was highlighted. The one universal feature of the Christian religion was its teaching of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God and this had already found social expression in democracy. Brown asked his listeners to observe how vitally the several lines converged. A new moral consciousness was dawning in science's devotion to truth and democracy's devotion to brotherhood, a consciousness so profound that it was already transforming the methods and spirit of general education; in time it would transform religion as well. When the transformation was effected religion and education would be free to find their universal, and, Brown strongly prophecied, their unified expression.

Brown's predecessor as United States Commissioner of Education, William T. Harris, shared his conviction that the separation of religion and schooling was a temporary expedient. In an address to the National

Educational Association in 1903, Harris declared that the separation of religion and education "was an incidental stage in the growth of civilization . . . it is not a permanent settlement of the matter."[45] Harris' Hegelianism enabled him to bear with the temporary separation because he believed that history itself would bring a larger and more inclusive synthesis to pass.

Thus buoyed up by an optimism coming from the synthezing idealism so characteristic of the period, and spurred on by the need to strengthen the educational ministry of the church spelled out so clearly at the 1903 conference, Protestant ministers, and laymen plunged actively into the religious education movement.[46] Soon the movement gave birth to curricular and methodological guides for the church and a new academic discipline for the seminary. The mood of religious educators was ebullient and some even began to believe that in their own brand of liberal Protestant faith they possessed the higher synthesis which Brown and Harris anticipated. Coe shared in some of these moods, even trying his hand at writing a curriculum guide, but his basically philosophic approach to the movement kept him aloof from such activity and from a too facile hope. His mood was closer to that of John Dewey, who in 1908 gave a sober warning to optimistic educators carried away by the belief that "the religion of the future" was already upon them.[47]

Dewey began his essay by disavowing any appeal to those who are already committed to special dogmas of religion or who believe "that religion is a monopoly or a protected industry." He spoke directly to the religious educators who took as their own the philosophy of the movement as outlined by Coe in 1904 and whose premises denied any breach between man and the world and God. When such educators seek "special religious education at special times and places,' then, he confessed, "a sense of unreality comes over me." They seem to say, he continued, that since religion is a

> . . . universal function of life, we must particularly safeguard it lest it disappear; that since religion is the consciousness of the spiritual import of experience, we must find mechanical appliances for developing it.[48]

Coe's total lifework shows how deeply sympathetic he was to the reasoning behind this complaint. As he followed the logic of his personalitic idealism to its uttermost limits, Coe moved further and further away from religious education as a form of pedagogy. It became increasingly a method for the social and theological reconstruction of the churches. It is not too much to say that religious education became for Coe what instrumentalism was for Dewey, a critical method of inquiry into existing morals and institutions.[49]

Over the years Coe would travel far with Dewey intellectually and arrive at nearly the same point. But each began their philosophic quests from positions which continued to influence their final pragmatism.

Dewey's starting point was Hegelian idealism and, as Morton White has pointed out, once the absolute dropped out of his thought nature was there waiting to replace it. Coe's starting point was personalistic idealism and reality always retained for him a personalistic cast. It would be his one lasting tie to historic Christianity.[50]

In his 1908 essay Dewey admitted the theoretical possibility that the antinomy between "coming to know" in science and religion could one day be overcome. On that day, a "grace and sanction" lacking in the culture since the dissolution of the medieval synthesis would be restored.[51] But however desirable it might be, that end, he warned, was very far from view in the first decade of the twentieth century. He cautioned his readers to remember the long history behind present-day religions and to expect a long, slow maturation period for the new religion. The transformation of historical religions into a religious awareness that would be the "flower and fruition of the human spirit" would only slowly emerge from within modern culture. He described the religion to be with a certain literary gracefulness which he once acknowledged Hegelianism gave to his writings and which he increasingly lost as he moved further and further into pragmatism;[52] but he wrote of Christianity with a pungency only rarely characteristic of his style: "Oriental in its origin, it has since been Latinized and Germanized and there are even those who have dreamed of humanizing it."[53]

It is not clear in the essay whether Dewey is still to be included among the last; nor is it clear whether the future religion "thoroughly naturalized in the hearts and minds of men so that it can be considered publicly, openly, and by common tests'[54] will be a humanized Christianity or an entirely new faith. Dewey was not directly concerned with this problem in the essay and he advised religious educators not to worry about the shape of the new religion. He called upon them to devote themselves persistently and patiently to "the development of the ideas of life which lie implicit in our still new science and our still newer democracy."[55]

Over the next four decades, in teaching and writing, Coe would devotedly pursue the meaning of religion within the limits of science and democracy. In his thought the lines between democracy and science, religion and education would converge into a complex pattern that is a veritable intellectual maze. But in mapping the mazes in his thought, the intellectual *Weltanschauung* of a whole generation of educators who sought a new moral and religious standard can be traced afresh.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Proceedings of the first Annual Convention of the Religious Education Association, February 10-12, 1903* (Chicago: Executive Office, Religious Education Association, 1903); hereafter cited as *Proceedings* (1903), full report of the program and original membership list are given on pp. 297-403; see *Religious Education* XXIII (1928): 609-705 for twenty-fifth anniversary memorial essays; quotation is from Shailer Mathews, "Inception of the Religious Education Association," *Religious Education* XXIII: 619-621; James B. Angell's address, 'The Next Step Forward in Religious Education," is found in *Proceedings* (1903), pp. 5-7.

[2] Caroline Hazard and Mary E. Wooley, presidents respectively of Wellesley and Mount Holyoke Colleges, were original members but did not attend the 1903 meeting; in 1904 Caroline Hazard was elected one of the sixteen vice-presidents of the Religious Education Association, *Proceedings of the Second Annual Convention of the Religious Education Association* (Chicago: Executive Office, Religious Education Association, 1904); the Roman Catholic Bishop of Peoria, John L. Spaulding, was elected to the Council of the Religious Education Association in 1904; however, the members, the tone, and the preoccupations of the early conferences identify the Religious Education Association as overwhelmingly Protestant.

[3] Robert W. Lynn, church historian on the faculty of Union Theological Seminary in New York City, is doing research in nineteenth century Protestant attitudes toward the public school frequently cited by Lawrence A. Cremin, the leading educational historian in America today; see Lynn's *Protestant Strategies in Education* (New York: Association Press, 1964); and his *The Big Little School: Sunday Child of American Protestantism* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971) with Elliott Wright; Cremin discussed the nineteenth century configuration of home, school, and church in his essay, "American Education: Some Notes Toward a New History,' an American Educational Research Association–Phi Delta Kappa Award Lecture given at the Annual Meeting of the AERA in 1969 and published as a monograph by Phi Delta Kappa International (Bloomington, 1972); Lynn described the ecology of educational institutions established by Protestants around 1820 in his "The Uses of History: An Inquiry Into the History of American Religious Education," *Religious Education* LXVII (March-April 1972): 83-97; Cremin acknowledged that if he were rewriting his book, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York: Random House, Inc., 1961), he would give greater attention to transformations within the American religious tradition which paralleled the educational transformation of the early twentieth century.

[4] Perhaps one of the most interesting and as yet untaped resources for documentation of this thesis is the *Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association, 1889*, devoted to the theme, "Do Denominational Schools Have a Place in America?' ; one of the participants, Bishop Keane, newly appointed Rector of Catholic University of America, spoke on behalf of Catholic parochial schools, pp. 114-123; his two opponents strongly implied–one asserted it flatly–that any church which needed to educate its people outside the public school system was a political threat to American's free institutions, pp. 123-147, 152-179.

[5] A great repository of arguments on the "non-sectarian' piety of Bible reading in the schools is *The Bible in the Public Schools: Arguments in the Case of John D. Minor et al vs. The Board of Education of the City of Cincinnati with the Opinions and Decision of the Court* (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke and Company, 1870; reprinted in 1967 by Da Capo Press); Judge Alonzo Taft's remarks on the control of the schools by Protestants are found on pp. 408, 410-411; Judge Taft's decision was cited in Abingdon School District vs. Schempp. U.S. *Reports*, CCCLXXIV, 215.

[6] Rush Rhees, "Religious Education as Affected by Historical Study of the Bible," *Proceedings* (1903), pp. 80-88.

[7] Paul Shorey's biographical sketch of Harper in *The Dictionary of American Biography* VIII: 287 *ff.* highlights Harper's many interests; see also Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, *William R. Harper: First President of the University of Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928); Joseph E. Gould, *The Chautauqua Movement: An Episode in the Continuing American Revolution* (New York: State University of New York, 1961) somewhat unconvincingly asserts that Harper used the Chautauqua movement as his model for the University of Chicago; Gould does give full details of Harper's work as Principal of the Chautauqua College of Liberal Arts, licensed by the New York Legislature to give degrees in 1883, pp. 13, 21; for Harper's dominating position at the 1903 conference, see *Religious Education* XXIII (1928): pp. 619-621, 637-640; two of Harper's many texts are *The Structure of the Text of the Book of Amos* (Chicago, 1904) and *The Priestly Element in the Old Testament, an Aid to Historical Study for Use in Advanced Bible Classes* (Chicago, 1905); he contributed "The University and Religious Education" to *The Trend in Higher Education* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905).

[8] In *Across the Busy Years: Recollections and Reflections* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), Nicholas Murray Butler makes no mention of the 1903 conference; Shailer Mathews recalled that he was prevented from attending the 1903 meeting by the illness of Mrs. Butler, "Inception of the Religious Education Association," *Religious Education* XXIII (1928): 621; reference to the tradition surrounding the Greek translation of the Old Testament can be found in *Septuaginta: Id Est Vetus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX Interpretes* edited by Alfred Rahlfs, 7th ed. (Stuttgart: Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1962), p. xii.

[9] Josiah Strong, *Our Country: Its Possible Future and Present Crisis* (New York: Baker & Taylor Co. for American Home Missionary Society, 1886; reprint ed. by Jurgen Herbst and published by Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1963).

[10] It is difficult to secure information about this early Sunday School at Teachers College; Professor Cremin in a letter to me dated January 6, 1970, indicated there are no extant records; the above information is from "Sophia Lyon Fahs Is 95: An Interview with a Pioneer Religious Educator," *The Religious Educator* I (September 1971), pp. 4-5.

[11] Moxom supported the Blair Amendment at a hearing conducted by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in February 1889; the Blair Amendment called for the teaching of the principles of the Christian religion in the public schools while at the same time reaffirming the principle of the separation of church and state and specifically the unconstitutionality of using public funds for church supported education; see *Notes of Hearings Before the Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, Friday, February 15 and Friday, February 22, 1889 on the Joint Resolution (S.R. 86) Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States Respecting Establishment of Religion and Free Public Schools* (Washington, 1889); Moxom also published *The Religion of Hope* (Boston, 1896).

[12] *Studies in Logical Theory*, published in 1903 by the University of Chicago Press, was a part of the Decennial Publications of the University; dedicated to William James, he, in turn, hailed it as the beginning of a Chicago School; see Jane Dewey's "Biography of John Dewey," in Paul Arthur Schilpp, ed., *The Philosophy of John Dewey* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1939; reprinted by Tudor Publishing Co., 1951).

[13] See Sydney Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972).

[14] James Russell was the first dean of Teachers College: see Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, 172 ff.; Frederick Elby, among other works, authored *The Development of Modern Education* (New York, 1940) with C. F. Arrowood; Herman Harrell Horne, Professor of Philosophy and Education at New York University from 1909 to 1940, wrote *The Democratic Philosophy of Education, Companion to Dewey's Democracy and Education: Exposition and Comment* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1932).

[15] Coe, "My Own Little Theatre," and Edward Diller Starbuck, "Religion's Use of Me," both in Vergelius Ferm, ed., *Religion in Transition* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1937); Ferm noted that were one to list the pioneers in the twentieth century born science of psychology of religion, one would unhesitatingly name Coe and Starbuck along with James B. Leuba.

[16] See Chapter III for full details.

[17] In July, 1903, Coe addressed the National Education Association on the same topic, *Proceedings of the National Education Association, 1903*, pp. 341-345; Coe, *Education for Citizenship: The Sovereign State as Ruler and as Teacher* (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1932).

[18] Jane Dewey wrote that after coming to Columbia University Dewey enjoyed associations with several members of the faculty of Union Theological Seminary; among these, she does not mention Coe, who served on the Union faculty from 1909 to 1922, "Biography of John Dewey," in Schlipp, *Philosophy of John Dewey*, pp. 3-34.

[19] Coe, "The Definitive Dewey," a review of *The Philosophy of John Dewey*, edited by Paul Arthur Schlipp (Evanston, 1939) in *Religious Education* XXXV (January-March 1940): 45-50.

[20] According Jane Dewey her father did not transfer his church membership when he moved to New York City in 1904, "Biography of John Dewey," Schlipp, *The Philosophy of John Dewey*; elected to the Council of the Religious Education Association in 1904, Dewey's name does not appear in membership lists after 1904.

[21] Frank Knight Sanders commented twenty-five years later on the youthfulness of the original members which permitted nearly all of them to remain active to the twenty-fifth anniversary in "Our Fallen Leaders," *Religious Education* XXIII (1928): 609-705.

[22] First published in the Student Christian Association, *University of Michigan* VI (November 1884): 23-25; reprinted in John Dewey, *The Early Works, 1882-1892*, Volume I, *Early Essays and Leibniz's New Essays Concerning the Human Understanding* (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969), pp. 61-63.

[23] See Chapter IV, Lynn and Wright, *The Big Little School*.

[24] This is perhaps most clearly seen in the call issued by the Council of Seventy, *Proceedings* (1903), p. 317; and also the Departments specified in the constitution adopted at the Conference, pp. 334-339; among the Departments

established were Universities and Colleges, Theological Seminaries, Secondary Public Schools, Elementary Public Schools, Home, and Libraries.

[25] Durkheim, in his 1902-03 lectures, noted that there exist two beings within each person, the individual being and the social being or type; the social being expresses "the ideas, sentiments, and practices" of the group of which we are a part and, Durkheim concluded,"to constitute this being in each of us is the end of education," *Education and Sociology* translated and with an introduction by Sherwood D. Fox (New York: The Free Press, 1956), p. 72.

[26] Werner Jaeger, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, 2 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1939); see Preface to the first volume.

[27] See Chapter I of Henry Steele Commager's *The American Mind: An Interpretation of American Thought and Character Since the 1880's* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), pp. 38 ff.; also Part II, "The Religion of the Heart," and Part V, "Education in a Democracy," in Richard Hofstadter's *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963); portions of Part V were first read at a 1961 Conference of The Committee's report, *Education and American History* (new York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1965), p. 16.

[28] As touching the public school, the apotheosis of this approach came in Oregon in 1922 when the state legislature passed a compulsory public school attendance bill; see David B. Tyack, "The Perils of Pluralism: The Background of the Pierce Case," *American Historical Review* LXXIV (October 1968): 74-98.

[29] Coe's confidence that the best in the culture is redemptive is clearly seen in his last book, *What is Religion Doing to our Consciences* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943).

[30] Kendig Brubaker Cully, *The Search for a Christian Education–Since 1940* (Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1965), summarized the critique made against the liberal religious education movement by its neo-orthodox critics; one of the earliest critics was H. Shelton Smith, *Faith and Nurture* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941).

[31] "The Philosophy of the Movement for Religious Education," *The American Journal of Theology* VIII (April 1904): 225-239; see also McMurray Smith Richey, "Conceptions of Man in the Thought of George Albert Coe and William C. Bower" (Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1954), p. 307.

[32] See below, Chapter II.

[33] Coe, "The Philosophy of the Movement for Religious Education," p. 226.

[34] Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1944; rev. ed. published in New York by George Braziller, Inc., 1959), pp. 71-77.

[35] Coe, "The Philosophy of the Movement for Religious Education," p. 229 and 231.

[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 321-332.

[37] The phrase is Merle Curti's in *The Social Ideas of American Educators* with a new chapter on "The Last Twenty-Five Years" (Paterson, New Jersey: Littlefield Adams and Co., 1965); originally published in 1935 as Vol. X of *The Report of the American Historical Association Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools* by Charles Scribner's Sons; see Chapter XII, "G. Stanley Hall: Evolutionist, 1846-1924," p. 406.

[38] Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

[39] Norris B. Woodie, "George Albert Coe's Concept of Valuation Applied to Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, 1955), p. 72; see also Chapter IV below.

[40] Coe, "The Philosophy of the Movement for Religious Education," pp. 230-231.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 236.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 237.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 239.

[44] Elmer Ellsworth Brown, "Some Relations of Religious Education and Secular Education," *Religious Education* II (April 1907-February 1908): 121-126; the address was given to an R.E.A. Conference held in conjunction with the N.E.A. meeting at Los Angeles, California, July 10, 1907.

[45] William Torrey Harris, "The Separation of the Church from the School Supported by Public Taxes," *Proceedings of the National Education Association*, 1903, pp. 351-360; both Brown and Harris were elected to the Council of the Religious Education Association in 1904.

[46] The early volumes of *Religious Education* are the best source for information on the years immediately following 1903; a good summary of the breadth of the movement is given in Robert W. Lynn, "The Uses of History: An Inquiry into the History of American Religious Education," *Religious Education* LXVII (March-April 1972): 83-97.

[47] John Dewey, "Religion and Our Schools," *Hibbert Journal* (July 1908); reprinted in Joseph Ratner, ed., *Intelligence in the Modern World: John Dewey's Philosophy* (New York: Random House, 1939), pp. 702-715.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 704.

[49] Morton White, *Social Thought in America: The Revolt Against Formalism* with a New Preface and Epilogue (Boston, Beacon Press, 1959), p. 7.

[50] Morton White, *The Origin of Dewey's Instrumentalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943), pp. 46-47; see also two doctoral studies: John Clifford Haney, Jr., "A Critical Comparison of the Educational Philosophy of John Dewey and George A. Coe" (Boston University, 1959) and Norris B. Woodie, "George Albert Coe's Concept of Valuation Applied to Education" (Yale, 1955).

[51] Dewey, "Religion and Our Schools," p. 703.

[52] John Dewey, "From Absolutism to Experimentalism," in G. P. Adams and W. P. Montague, *Contemporary American Philosophy*, vol. 2 (New York: Macmillan, 1930), pp. 16-17; quoted by Herman Harrell Horne in the Preface to his *The Democratic Philosophy of Education*.

[53] Dewey, "Religion and Our Schools," p. 709.

[54] *Ibid.* p. 711.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 715.

PART II

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON THE EDUCATIONAL HISTORY OF BLACK AMERICANS

Industrial Philanthropy and Black Higher Education 1915-1930

James D. Anderson
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign

The American Missionary Association, Freedmen's Aid Society, Presbyterian Board of Missions for the Freedmen, and the American Baptist Home Mission Society were the most important contributors to black higher education from 1865 to 1915. These Northern mission societies, with a fervor reminiscent of the ante-bellum abolitionist crusade, embraced liberal education as a panacea for black emancipation and began a campaign in the Reconstruction era which laid the foundation for black higher education. By 1915 missionary philanthropists had established over one hundred colleges and secondary schools for blacks and these institutions enrolled approximately 7,773 secondary students and 2,517 college and professional students. Thus, missionary educators could (and often did) boast of impressive achievements for their campaigns to establish black higher education. Their efforts came at a critical time when public secondary schools for Southern blacks were almost nonexistent and there was virtually no public support for black higher education. Even DuBois, who was not noted for romanticizing white missionaries, praised the mission societies for producing over "thirty thousand black teachers in the South" which wiped out the illiteracy of the majority of black people in America.[1]

The missionary philanthropists, basically egalitarian in their views of race relations, launched the movement for black higher education as a means to produce a college-bred black vanguard that would lead the race in its struggle for equal rights. To the mission societies, leadership training meant, above all, education in the highest branches of knowledge. Henry L. Morehouse, executive secretary of the Baptist Home Mission Society, argued that the black race would progress largely through the wise leadership of a gifted intelligentsia, and he placed top priority on the higher education of the "talented tenth." Thomas J. Morgan, an official of the Society and editor of the *Home Mission Monthly*, maintained that black advancement depended on the leadership of "noble and powerful minds raised up from their own ranks." Similarly, William Hayes Ward, for many years chairman of the American Missionary Association's executive committee, argued for the highest form of liberal education to effectively train a black leadership. The missionaries naturally offered the New England classical curriculum as the key to Southern black progress and were very self-righteous about their program to assimilate blacks into the culture of white Protestant society. But to more conservative whites, both North and South, the egalitarian creed of the missionary colleges threatened to prolong the racial crisis in Southern society. Conservative white America was perturbed and fearful of the missionaries' push for racial

72

equality and particularly of their efforts to train a black leadership that would demand the right to participate fully in the promise of American life.[2]

The missionary philanthropists' defiance of Southern racism, however, never reached its potential challenge. By 1900 they were poverty stricken and their programs to establish and sustain independent black colleges were rapidly diminishing in scope and activity. In looking at the future of black higher education the missionaries had many reasons to be downhearted. By any standards the material and financial status of black colleges was bad. They were understaffed, meagerly equipped, and poorly financed. The combined efforts of the missionary and black organizations could not raise sufficient funds to meet annual operating expenses, to increase teachers' salaries, expand the physical plant, improve the libraries, or purchase new scientific and technical equipment. But more importantly, almost all of the missionary black colleges were totally without sufficient endowments to insure their survival. Cut off from the aid of the federal government and the Southern states, combined with the impoverished state of the mission societies, the black colleges entered the twentieth century starved for funds. Thus, they were in an extremely dependent position.

The decline of missionary philanthropy was accompanied by the ascendancy of industrial philanthropy which had been struggling to become a dominant force in Southern education since the establishment of the Peabody Fund in 1867 and the Slater Fund in 1881. As the abolitionists launched the campaign for equal rights after emancipation and sought to train a progressive black leadership to lessen the force of Southern racism, industrial philanthropists, backed by Northeastern capitalists, struggled to achieve black subordination, and attempted to develop a conservative black leadership that would encourage the race to submit willingly to a racial caste system.[3] Throughout the nineteenth century industrial philanthropists remained subordinate in the scheme of black higher education, concentrating their funds mainly on Hampton and Tuskegee to support an accommodationist black leadership which sought to retain blacks in the South primarily as unskilled and semi-skilled agricultural and domestic laborers. Moreover, the subordinate role of industrial philanthropy during the nineteenth century was due in large part to the more economically and politically powerful missionary movement that controlled virtually all of the significant black colleges.

But by 1901 industrial philanthropists cemented an important alliance with Southern white leaders which was ratified by the creation of two major educational foundations, the Southern Education Board in 1901 and the General Education Board in 1902. The Southern Education Board, intersectional in membership and financed largely by Northern philanthropists, was a propaganda organization that concentrated primarily on arousing Southern white support for universal education. The General Education Board, established in 1902 by John D. Rockefeller, served as a clearinghouse for industrial philanthropy and disbursed grants to institutions and educational agencies. The membership of both Boards was almost the same and, in 1914, the General Education Board absorbed the Southern Education Board. The General Education Board became a powerful philanthropic trust as Rockefeller supplemented his initial grant of $1,000,000 by others amounting to $53,000,000 by 1909. Moreover, the Board became an interlocking directorate of Northern philanthropy as its members directed the disbursements of the Peabody and Slater Funds and the Anna T. Jeanes Foundation which was established in 1907. As Louis Harlan so aptly put it, the Board assumed "virtual monopolistic control of educational philanthropy for the South and the Negro."[4]

The industrial philanthropists were more concerned with education as a means to economic organization and efficiency and political stability than with the civil and human rights of Southern blacks. Economically, they were similar to other twentieth century urban reformers who demanded an organized and efficient agricultural sector to supplement the emergent industrial nation.[5] Their concern for Southern agricultural prosperity was inextricably bound to black farm workers, especially in a period of declining rural population and rapid urban growth. To the philanthropists, the black worker was the last best hope to stimulate material prosperity in the South's agricultural economy. Thus, New York philanthropist Robert C. Ogden, president of the Southern Education Board, expressed the organization's philosophy in the words: "Our great problem is to attach the Negro to the soil and Prevent his exodus to the city." In his view, "The prosperity of the South depend[ed] upon the productive power of the black man."[6] The industrial philanthropists comfortably embraced the idea that blacks should perform the lowest kind of labor in the Southern economy. Railroad executive William H. Baldwin, president of the General Education Board, fittingly stated the philanthropists' policy of black economic servitude:

> In the Negro is the opportunity of the South. Time has proven that he is best fitted to perform the heavy labor in the Southern states. "The Negro and the mule is the only combination so far to grow cotton." The South needs him; but the South needs him educated to be a suitable citizen. Properly directed he is the best possible laborer to meet the climatic conditions of the South. He will willingly fill the more menial positions, and do the heavy work, at less wages, than the American white man or any foreign race which has yet come to our shores. This will permit the Southern white laborers to perform the more expert labor, and to leave the fields, the mines, and the simpler trades for the Negro.

Despite the self-delusion of some reformers and the pronouncements of many historians, the industrial philanthropists' interest in Southern education, especially in black education, was not primarily out of compassion or a desire for Negro advancement, but was based mainly on the belief that there could be no Southern economic revival, no consequent sound national economy, without an educated black work force. Most industrial philanthropists mirrored Ogden's and Baldwin's views of Southern Educational reform.[7]

Their interest in harnessing the black race as the dominant laboring force for Southern agriculture motivated the philanthropists to organize a black leadership that would encourage the race to at least tolerate a subordinate status. At the dawn of the twentieth century they were optimistic that Hampton and Tuskegee would produce a conservative black vanguard that would urge the black masses to remain in the South as efficient servants and agricultural laborers. Ogden, who was at once president of Hampton's and Tuskegee's Board of Trustees, maintained that Tuskegee's "first and large work' was to produce "industrial leadership, especially in agriculture." Booker T. Washington, of course, typified this black industrial vanguard which pressed the race to seek its fortune in Southern agriculture. He frequently asserted that in the Southern economy "the Negro is given almost as good an opportunity to rise as is given to the white man.' Washington vigorously claimed that the black man had "a better chance in the South than in the North" for economic progress. By 1905 the philanthropists, with Washington's assistance, had organized a vanguard to propagate the Hampton-Tuskegee Ideology. Included in this leadership was Robert R. Moton of Hampton Institute; Isaac Fisher, principal of the Colored Branch Normal College in Pine Bluff, Arkansas; W. J. Edwards, principal of Snow Hill Institute in Alabama; Henry A. Hunt, principal of Fort Valley High and Industrial School; and William H. Holtzclaw, principal of Utica, Mississippi's Industrial and Normal School. Convinced that this type of leadership could achieve ideological hegemony over the black South, the industrial philanthropists largely supported the Hampton-Tuskegee pattern of black education from 1880 to 1915, and generally rejected higher education for blacks as having no immediate utility. As Baldwin put it, "Except in the rarest of instances, I am bitterly opposed to the so-called higher education of Negroes."[8]

Thus, industrial philanthropists took care to avoid giving grants to the missionary black colleges. Black and white egalitarians naturally interpreted the philanthropists' actions as opposition to black collegiate education. Yet the philanthropists were not so much opposed to the black college as they were to the type of black leaders which emerged from the missionary institutions. The missionaries insisted that it was absolutely essential for the race to develop a liberally educated leadership that would protest against the subordinate roles accorded blacks in Southern society. Moreover, the college educated blacks perceived themselves as a vanguard leading the struggle for racial equality. Industrial philanthropists, in contrast to the black and white egalitarians, believed that black opposition to the Southern racial hierarchy threatened to prolong the "Negro problem" and prevent the political and economic compromises prerequisite to bring the South abreast of Northeastern industrial standards. To the philanthropists, if black leaders would exhort their people to accept and be content with menial labor and a subordinate racial status, the South would achieve political stability and economic progress. They viewed the achievement of order and material prosperity more critical to the national welfare than the continued agitation of black and white liberals for egalitarian changes. But the philanthropists' objection to the egalitarian ideology of black college graduates should not be interpreted as absolute opposition to the idea of a highly trained black leadership. They recognized the obvious fact that a segregated black community needed its own educators, professionals, and social service persons to provide for the welfare of the black population. Their struggle was not against the development of a black educated class, but for the ideological allegiance of black intellectuals to sanction the philanthropic campaign for white supremacy, black subordination, political order, and economic progress. In an attempt to quiet DuBois's attack upon the repressive nature of the philanthropists' educational program, Peabody stated that he was "frequently distressed" by the "extreme aspect" of DuBois's criticisms and argued that the policy of "non-resistance" was the wisest path. DuBois replied acidly: "I do believe in fighting, and by fighting, I mean agitation of all decent kinds to arouse people to the sense of surrounding evil. Without this we should never get anywhere." DuBois's ideology epitomized the kind of thinking that the philanthropists were struggling to eliminate or control in the emerging black intelligentsia. At the turn of the century the industrial philanthropists attempted to squelch the challenge to the Southern social order by strongly supporting the Hampton-Tuskegee network which preached hard work, patience, and accommodation. But by 1915, as the more radical black intelligentsia increased in status and power, the philanthropists, in a desperate attempt to influence the ideological development of emerging black leaders, were forced to challenge the egalitarian traditions of the missionary black colleges. Thus, instead of ignoring the black colleges the philanthropists were suddenly compelled to attempt to control them in order to keep alive their efforts to win the ideological allegiance of influential black leaders.[9]

A confluence of shifting political circumstances and racial developments generated philanthropic interests in the black college. Significantly, the philanthropists recognized that the Tuskegee machine was rapidly losing ground to the college-bred black vanguard. In 1911, Peabody admitted privately that the "large majority" of blacks followed DuBois.[10] This discovery broke forth with unprecedented force after World War I with the growing militancy of the young black intellectuals. The rising tide of this new mood was manifested in the emergence of a more radical black press, the regional and local expansion of the NAACP, and the literary tenor of the Harlem renaissance. Even more importantly, the rank and file black population was rapidly outstripping its intellectuals in resisting the subordinate status accorded the race. The nationalist politics of Marcus Garvey's incredible mass movement, and the race riots which spread across the nation from 1917 to 1919 demonstrated the increased politicization of the black community. Moreover, the migration of blacks from the South to the urban North, also a political reply to the masses, indicated the weakness of the accommodationist ideology which urged blacks to remain in the South principally as agricultural and domestic workers. What started in 1900 as largely a regional question had become by 1920 a national race problem. From the vantage point of the philanthropists, this situation increased the urgency to obtain the allegiance of the ascendant black intellectual class.[11]

The industrial philanthropists' first major attempt to control black high education came in 1915 when the General Education Board decided to "take hold" of Fisk University and develop it as a model college for black youth. The preeminent Fisk University was founded and supported initially by the American Missionary Association. To the philanthropists, it was the "capstone" of black higher education. Wallace Buttrick, then president of the General Education Board, said "Perhaps the most promising of the academic institutions for the higher education of the Negro is Fisk University." Outside of Howard University, Fisk had nearly twenty percent of the black college students enumerated in the Federal Report of 1917. Only two Southern black colleges had at that time one-fourth as many college students as Fisk. Thus, when the General Education Board held a private conference in 1915 to discuss the future of black higher education, Fisk University's President Fayette Avery McKenzie was invited as a key representative of black higher education.[12]

McKenzie, a sociologist at the Ohio State University before coming to Fisk in 1915, was quickly regarded by industrial philanthropists as the kind of leader that would help make Fisk a more conservative institution. More than any of his predecessors, McKenzie sought to make Fisk acceptable to the white South and urged its graduates to concentrate on the economic development of the region. In his inaugural address McKenzie paid homage to Fisk's liberal arts tradition but introduced a new concept of "service" education which promised that the college would help restore the South to economic prosperity. He maintained that,

> It was the function of Fisk to increase the material wealth of the nation . . . Fisk University claims the right to say that it will be one of the chief factors in achieving larger prosperity for the South. Every dollar spent here in the creation of power may mean a thousand dollars of increase in wealth of the South within a single generation.

McKenzie attempted to persuade Fisk's students to forsake egalitarian principles and to work within the Southern racial hierarch to improve the region's industrial efficiency and maintain interracial cooperation.[13] This policy pleased the industrial philanthropists and they hailed McKenzie's inauguration as a new and wise departure from the missionary tradition

Consequently, as Raymond Wolters has demonstrated, McKenzie set out to convince the industrial philanthropists that "Fisk students were not radical egalitarians but young men and women who had learned to make peace with the reality of the caste system." To this end, McKenzie disbanded the student government association, forbade student dissent, and suspended the Fisk Herald, the oldest student publication among black colleges. He would not allow a campus chapter of the NAACP and instructed the librarian to excise radical articles in the NAACP literature. Student discipline was rigorously enforced, special "Jim Crow" entertainments were arranged for the white benefactors of the university and Paul D. Cravath, the president of the Fisk Board of Trustees, endorsed complete separation as "the only solution to the Negro problem." McKenzie would not allow certain forms of social intercourse such as dancing and holding hands, and he justified his code of discipline on the grounds that black students were particularly sensuous beings who needed to be subjected to firm control. In short, McKenzie attempted to repress student initiative, undermine their egalitarian spirit, and control their thinking on race relations in order to produce a class of black intellectuals that would uncomplainingly accept the Southern racial hierarchy.[14]

From the outset industrial philanthropists reinforced McKenzie's behavior by contributing their economic and political support to his regime. Philanthropists Julius Rosenwald, who visited Fisk at McKenzie's installation, was initially ambivalent about the possibility of transforming the college into an accommodationist institution. In revealing his "mixed feelings" about Fisk students to Abraham Flexner, the secretary of the General Education Board, Rosenwald stated, "There seemed to be an air of superiority among them and a desire to take on the spirit of the white university rather than the spirit which has always impressed me at Tuskegee." To Rosenwald and other industrial philanthropists, Tuskegee was training black leaders to maintain a separate and subordinate Negro society. They were primarily interested in supporting black institutions committed to this mission. Thus, Flexner assured Rosenwald that McKenzie, with the help of industrial philanthropy, was working to transform Fisk into an institution more acceptable to Southern white society. Toward this end, the General Education Board began appropriating in 1916 about $12,000 annually to help Fisk pay its yearly operating expenses. In 1917, the Board contributed $50,000 to Fisk for endowment and building purposes and persuaded the Carnegie Corporation to give the same amount. Still Fisk had no substantial endowment, was deeply indebted, its physical plant was deteriorating, and its faculty was poorly paid. According to Hollingsworth Wood, vice chairman of the Fisk Board of Trustees, "$1,600 has been the maximum salary of a professor at Fisk University. This has meant lack of food in some cases." Fisk authorities knew that the college could not really survive without a sizeable endowment, and sufficient money could be raised only from the industrial philanthropists. Under these circumstances, however, a certain amount of compromise was required. As McKenzie put it, "intimation has been made to me from several sources that if we continue to behave ourselves, if we are efficient in teaching and administration and continue to hold the right relationship to our environment, we can expect large and highly valuable financial aid in carrying out a great program at Fisk."[15]

The philanthropists' financial assistance to Fisk University was accompanied by a new coalition of Negro accommodationists, Southern whites, and Northern businessmen which took control of the University's administration from the old alliance of black and white egalitarians. McKenzie and the philanthropists restructured the Fisk Board of Trustees to reflect the new power realities. In October of 1915 Thomas Jesse Jones, director of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, informed Flexner of the new changes:

> The Board of Trustees is being strengthened. Governor Brumbaugh and two influential colored men have been added in the last few weeks. With Mr. Cravath and Dr. Washington as trustees and the constant attention which I can give to the institution, we have at least a guarantee of fairly sound educational policy.

By 1919 Jones was Executive Secretary of the Fisk Board of Trustees and one of five members on the Executive Committee. In 1920 the philanthropists, acting through the General Education Board, agreed to spearhead a campaign to obtain for Fisk a two-million dollar endowment and their strength on the University's Board of Trustees increased. William H. Baldwin, son of the General Education Board's first chairman, was appointed by the Board to chair the endowment committee. He was immediately appointed to the Fisk Board of Trustees and became in 1924 the chairman of the trustees' executive committee. Other conservatives were added as the philanthropists moved in a quiet and forceful manner to reorganize the school's administration. In May of 1920, Fisk University's trustee Hollingsworth Wood notified the president of the General Education Board that,

> Dr. Moton of Tuskegee is now on the Board; Miss Ella Sachs, daughter of Samuel Sachs, and a close friend of the Rosenwalds, is an eager new member; and Mrs. Beverly B. Mumford of Richmond, Virginia adds an excellent influence from the Southern viewpoint.

The traditional missionary egalitarians were gradually pushed off the Fisk Board of Trustees. They were replaced mainly by Northern businessmen and a few conservative Negroes who were virtually hand-picked by industrial philanthropists. The philanthropists were actually raising an endowment for a new Fisk that was largely controlled by their agents and supporters.[16]

The philanthropists no doubt hoped that their economic and firm political hold on Fisk would squelch the school's egalitarian tradition and allow them to develop a more conservative black professional class. In 1923 the General Education Board generated a memorandum on the Fisk endowment campaign which emphasized the urgent need to train "the right type of colored leaders" who would help make the Negro "a capable workman and a good citizen." The philanthropists recognized that they were facing a new situation between the races. "How the Negro is going to get on in this country and what his relations are to be with the whites, are no longer problems of a single section; they are national," the memorandum stated. To the philanthropists, this new situation, in the context of growing race friction, increased the necessity of training "the right kind" of black leaders. The report maintained that,

> Due to various experiences during and since the World War, there is a growing disposition among the Negroes to suspect all white men and their motives and therefore to break all contacts with them and go it alone. Because such a movement by ten percent of the population is obviously futile, is no reason to overlook the fact that ten percent is a large enough proportion to cause considerable harm if permitted to go off at a tangent from the general interest. This very real menace to the public welfare makes the strengthening of school facilities for Negroes a matter of national significance.

The philanthropists reasoned that they could define and generally direct the socio-political paths of the black race by controlling its professional class.

> The Negro has become extremely race-conscious and turns to his teachers, preachers, newspapers, doctors, and professional men and women for leadership. The training of these persons who, because of their positions, are looked to for leadership, thus becomes of primary importance to the future of the Negro and to the general welfare of the nation.

It was on the basis of such considerations that industrial philanthropists were motivated to "select a leading Negro college for proper development." This development, as the memorandum stated, was aimed primarily at "helping the Negro to the sane and responsible leadership that the South wants him to have." To the white South, "sane" Negro leadership was that type of guidance which sought to make the race content with servile living and working conditions. The philanthropists, in their efforts to restore the South to political order and economic prosperity, urged black leaders to advocate industrial efficiency and non-resistance to the region's racial hierarchy.[17]

By 1920, however, there was no powerful segment of the black intelligentsia that would cooperate with the philanthropists in their efforts to settle the "Negro problem" by compromising the

80

fundamental rights of American blacks. In March of 1920, the *Crisis* published a revealing article by Harry H. Jones which essentially argued that, except for R. R. Moton, few black leaders accepted the Washington philosophy of accommodation. The liberal and radical wings of the black intelligentsia were the ascendant political voices in the black community and the philanthropists understood the meaning of this change to their own political program. Philanthropist George Peabody, having read the Jones' article, apprised Hampton's principal James Gregg of its implications:

> It is clear to me, with the Negro people having found themselves in a general way, during the war excitement, there is some danger of sharp definitely conscious line of division. We must, I think, give great weight in the present temper of susceptibility to the advertising influence of the *Crisis* and other publications, including James Weldon Johnson in The New York *Age*.

The problem, for the philanthropists, was how to secure an articulate black conservative wing with sufficient status within the race to counter the influence of men like DuBois, Trotter, and Johnson.[18]

Peabody wanted a conservative black leader to "write the most effective reply, which I have in mind, to the article in the March issue of the *Crisis*." Significantly he did not believe that Moton or Fred Moore, the New York *Age's* editor who sympathized with Moton's accommodationist philosophy, had sufficient status as black leaders to challenge Johnson and DuBois. In fact, Peabody could only think of Isaac Fisher as a potentially effective ideologue of the industrial philanthropic view. Interestingly, Fisher, a Tuskegee graduate who took his ideology from Washington, was appointed to the Fisk administration shortly after McKenzie became president. When McKenzie suspended the student operated *Fisk Herald* he established the conservative *Fisk University News* and made Fisher its editor. Following the bitter race riots of 1919, in a period of rising black militancy, Fisher called for the return of the "conservative Negro." He castigated the liberal and radical segments of the black intelligentsia which he claimed had "muzzled" the voice of the conservative Negro, and taken away his "mandate to speak for his race." Fisher defined the conservative Negro leader as one who urged his people to lay a foundation in economic efficiency, to submit willingly to the laws and customs of the South, and to work for better race relations through the guidance of the "best white South." Toward this end, he instituted at Fisk in 1917 a seminar on "Race Relations" and later became a member of the Southern white dominated Commission on Interracial Co-operation. Yet such conservatives as Fisher and Moton could not really challenge the intellectual hegemony which the liberals and radicals had achieved over the black community by 1917. DuBois probably expressed the dominant black view toward the conservative wing when he informed the Commission on Interracial Co-operation that, "Isaac Fisher represents nothing but his own blubbering self.

Major Moton is a fine fellow, but weak in the presence of white folks." To DuBois and many other black leaders who demanded full American rights for blacks, Moton and Fisher were "the sort of Colored men that we call 'White Folks' Niggers.'"[19]

But despite the protest of independent intellectuals like DuBois, Trotter, and Johnson, the private black college shouldered the main burden of educating the emerging black intellectual class. Southern white institutions would not accept black students and Northern white institutions would only allow token black representation. The black state and Federally supported schools generally were not allowed to offer liberal arts degrees. Outside of Howard University, which enrolled 1,053 college students, in 1917, the 27 black land grant and state institutions enrolled only 52 college students. The philanthropists understood this reality and black private schools were told to accommodate to philanthropic interest or starve. As Flexner put it, the philanthropists would "not try to suppress them or consolidate them, but just let them 'sweat.'" For a long period the black college paid dearly for its independence and egalitarianism but was forced by economic circumstances to eventually compromise with industrial philanthropy. Even the most egalitarian black leaders understood this dilemma. President John Hope of Morehouse, a courageous and dedicated leader for black equal rights, was compelled to turn to Washington for economic support in 1910. Hope especially wondered if his friend, DuBois, would understand the compromise and he took care to point out that he had not abolished his radical principles:

> You may remember too, that while some may have answered the call to that seemingly radical meeting in New York last May, I was the only President, colored or white, of our colleges that took part in the deliberations of that meeting. I cite this to show that I have dared to live up to my views even when they threw me in the midst of the most radical.

DuBois understood that Hope's actions merely indicated the extent to which the black college was "tongue-tied and bound." "I must say frankly that I do not see any other course of action . . . . In your position of responsibility your institution must stand foremost in your thought."[20]

The industrial philanthropists, acutely aware of the black college dilemma, pushed ahead with their campaign to endow Fisk. By 1917 Fisk enrolled 188 of the 737 college students in private black institutions and Virginia Union University, with 51, had the next largest enrollment. The philanthropists no doubt understood the importance of conquering Fisk in their efforts to achieve hegemony over black higher education. By June 1924 they had successfully conducted a campaign for Fisk's million dollar endowment. The following pledges were then in hand: $500,000 from the General Education Board; $250,000 from the Carnegie Corporation; and $250,000 secured elsewhere, including sizeable pledges from such philanthropists as Julius

Rosenwald and George Peabody. This endowment fund was not, however, collectable until the deficits, which Fisk had accumulated, were met. The outstanding indebtedness of that date was $70,000. To meet this indebtedness a special campaign by Nashville's white citizens for $50,000 was successfully completed by June 1924. This campaign was led by Nashville's Commercial Club which included Tennessee's governor, Nashville's mayor and many of the city's leading businessmen. From 1915 to 1924, Fisk had become so conservative that the Commercial Club was inspired to call Fisk "the key" to interracial cooperation and understanding in the South. "He came into our midst unknown," the Commercial Club said of McKenzie, "and by his wise administration and official methods won our hearty co-operation." With such backing, plans were perfected for raising the money to eliminate the school's deficits and thereby secure the endowment for Fisk's financial rehabilitation.[21]

At this juncture, however, McKenzie's conservative administration was attacked by black students, intellectuals, and community organizations. Led by DuBois, the Fisk Alumni attacked McKenzie's Draconian code of student discipline and were outraged by the humiliation and insults perpetrated on the University's students. DuBois openly challenged the school's administration in 1924 when he was invited to give the commencement address. He especially criticized the administration's campaign to suppress Fisk's egalitarian tradition in order to obtain economic support from industrial philanthropy. The students, long dissatisfied with McKenzie's regime, were reinforced by Alumni support and escalated their protest against the school's repressive policies. In January of 1925, the *New York Times* reported that Fisk's Alumni was organizing in "all sections of the United States to agitate for the removal of Dr. Fayette McKenzie, the white president of the University." The following month the students went on strike against McKenzie's administration, and as Wolters has shown, they were backed in their protest by the alumni, the black press, and the local black community. On the day following the student rebellion more than 2,500 black citizens of Nashville convened and formally declared that McKenzie's "usefulness as president of Fisk is at an end." This protest forced McKenzie to resign in April of 1925.[22]

DuBois praised the students' victory over McKenzie and hailed them as the new breed of black intellectuals necessary to challenge the power of industrial philanthropy:

> God speed the breed! Suppose we do lose Fisk; suppose we lose every cent that the entrenched millionaires have set aside to buy our freedom and stifle our complaints. They have the power, they have the wealth, but glory to God we still own our own souls. and led by young men like these at Fisk, let us neither flinch nor falter, but fight, and fight and fight again.

But many black intellectuals, especially those responsible for black colleges, could not easily afford to attack the policies of industrial philanthropy. After the Fisk rebellion, the General Education Board withheld the endowment pledges on the grounds that they were not collectable until Fisk eliminated all of its deficits. The Nashville Commercial Club, which was expected to raise the capital to cover the deficits, withdrew from the campaign following McKenzie's resignation. Convinced that McKenzie's successor, Thomas Elsa Jones, did "not conceive himself to be a leader or an emancipator of the Negro group," the philanthropists eventually granted Fisk the endowment. Fisk, however, was still dependent on industrial philanthropy. From 1915 to 1960, the General Education Board alone disbursed over $5,000,000 to Fisk. During the same period it also granted over $5,800,000 to Atlanta University; $1,900,000 to Morehouse; $2,150,000 to Dillard University; $3,500,000 to Spellman; and $1,100,000 to Clark College. In all the General Education Board's expenditures to black higher education, from 1902 to 1960, amounted to $41,410,399. Thus, given the philanthropists' demand for a conservative black leadership, especially in the 1920s and 1930s, a certain amount of compromise was inevitable. This undoubtedly affected the ability of black colleges to deal squarely with the economic and political exploitation of black people. Few black college leaders could afford to challenge, as DuBois did, the "power in high places, white power, power backed by unlimited wealth." But many black college leaders, under extremely difficult conditions, made some compromises in order to maintain black higher education without abolishing its vital thrust toward the establishment of an independent black intelligentsia. Educators, like Hope, held together the college system while more independent social critics, like DuBois, reminded the emerging black intellectuals of the essential struggle: "Let us never forget that the arch enemy of the Negro race is the false philanthropists who kicks us in the mouth when we cry out in honest and justifiable protest."[23]

NOTES

[1] James M. McPherson, *The Abolitionist Legacy: From Reconstruction to the NAACP* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), pp. 143, 148, 152, 205-206, 223, Appendix B.

[2] Henry L. Morehouse, "The Talented Tenth," *Baptist Home Mission Monthly*, Vol. XVIII (August, 1896), p. 277; Thomas J. Morgan, *The Negro in America and the Ideal American Republic* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1898); William Hayes Ward, "Higher Education," *Baptist Home Mission Monthly*, Vol. XXII (November, 1900), p. 322; McPherson, *The Abolitionist Legacy*, chapter 12.

[3] James D. Anderson, "Education as a Vehicle for the Manipulation of Black Workers," in Walter Feinberg and Henry Rosemont, Jr. (Eds.), *Work, Technology and Education, Dissenting Essays in the Intellectual Foundations of American Education* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975), pp. 15-40; Anderson, "Education for Servitude: The Social Purposes of Schooling in the Black South, 1870-1930" (University of Illinois, Ph.D. Dissertation, 1973), see especially chapters 4 and 5.

[4] Raymond B. Fosdick, *Adventure in Giving: The Story of the General Education Board* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962); Louis Harlan, *Separate and Unequal: Public School Campaigns and Racism in the Southern Seaboard States 1901-1915* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958), 1968 Atheneum edition, p. 86-87.

[5] For an Excellent treatment of urban interest in organizing American agriculture see David Byers Danbom, "The Industrialization of Agriculture, 1900-1930" (Stanford University, Ph.D. Dissertation, 1974).

[6] Robert C. Ogden to Mrs. Arthur Gilman (May 12, 1903), Box 6, Robert C. Ogden papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. (Hereafter listed as Ogden Papers; Odgen, "Speech on Negro Education" (1900), Box 22, Ogden Papers.

[7] William H. Baldwin, "The Present Problem of Negro Education in the South," *Proceedings of the Second Capon Springs Conference for Education in the South* (Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1899), pp. 94-100, 106; for similar philanthropic views see Henry S. Enck, "The Burden Borne: Northern White Philanthropy and Southern Black Industrial Education" (University of Cincinnati, Ph.D. Dissertation, 1970), pp. 152-164; Anderson, "Education as a Vehicle for the Manipulation of Black Workers," pp. 31-38; Robert Jay Rusnak, "Walter Hines Page and *The World's Work* 1900-1913" (University of California, Santa Barbara, Ph.D. Dissertation, 1973), chapters 7 and 8.

[8] Robert C. Ogden to Mrs. Arthur Gilman (May 12, 1903), Box 6, Ogden Papers; Booker T. Washington (Ed.), *Tuskegee and Its People: Their Ideals and Achievement* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1905); Baldwin quotation from Fosdick, *Adventure in Giving*, p. 11; Washington quotations from Anderson, "Education for Servitude," p. 176.

[9] George F. Peabody to W.E.B. DuBois (August 26, 1911); DuBois to Peabody (August 28, 1911); Peabody to DuBois (September 1, 1911), Box 6, Ogden Papers.

[10] George F. Peabody to Edgar Gardner Murphy (October 14, 1911), Box 1, George F. Peabody Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. (hereafter listed as Peabody Papers).

[11] Harry H. Jones, "The Crisis in Negro Leadership" *Crisis*, 19 (March, 1920), pp. 256-59; Robert H. Brisbane, *The Black Vanguard: Origins of the Negro Social Revolution, 1900-1960*, Ch. 2-4 (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1970).

[12] Thomas Jesse Jones (Ed.), *Negro Education: A Study of the Private and Higher Schools For Colored People in the United States*, Vol. I (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1917), pp. 310, 314-15; Howard enrolled 1,001 of the 1,053 college students in black public colleges and Fisk enrolled 188 of the 737 students in the college curriculum at black private institutions; The General Education Board's Conference on Negro Education (November 29, 1915), G.E.B. Files.

[13] Fayette A. McKensie, *Ideals of Fisk* (Nashville: Fisk University Press, 1915), p. 7; Herbert Aptheker (Ed.), *W.E.B. DuBois: The Education of Black People* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1973), pp. 52-57; DuBois, "Fisk," *Crisis* 27: 251-252; Raymond Wolters, *The New Negro on Campus: Black College Rebellions of the 1920s* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), pp. 35-39.

[14] The most thorough study of McKenzie's repressive educational practices is Wolters, *The New Negro*, chapter 2, "W.E.B. DuBois and the Rebellion at Fisk University," pp. 29-69.

[15] Julius Rosenwald to Abraham Flexner (January 15, 1917), Box 138, General Education Board Files, Rockefeller Foundation Archives (hereafter listed as G.E.B. Files); Flexner to Rosenwald (January 17, 1917), Box 138, G.E.B. Files; Flexner to Harold H. Swift (April 2, 1917); Stewart B. Applegat to H. J. Thorkelson (June 12, 1928), "Appropriations Made by the General Education Board to Fisk University"; For endowment contributions see report of William H. Baldwin to General Education Board (October 6, 1924); L. Hollingsworth Wood to the General Education Board (May 6, 1920); Box 138, G.E.B. Files; *Fisk University News* (December, 1924), p. 20.

[16] *Fisk University News* (April), 1923, p. 7; *Fisk University News* (October, 1920), p. 21; Thomas Jesse Jones to Abraham Flexner (October 4, 1915); L. Hollingsworth Wood to Wallace Buttrick (May 6, 1920); H. J. Thorkelson to L. Hollingsworth Wood (November 5, 1926), Box 138, G.E.B. Files. For the philanthropists' role in actively recruiting trustees see Abraham Flexner to Julius Rosenwald (January 8, 1917); Rosenwald to Flexner (January 13, 1917); Flexner to Rosenwald (January 17, 1917); Flexner to Harold H. Swift (April 2, 1917); Flexner to Harry Pratt Judson (March 27, 1917); Judson to Flexner (March 30, 1917); Judson to Flexner (April 13, 1917), Box 138, G.E.B. Files.

[17] Flexner, Memorandum on the Fisk Endowment Campaign (May 25, 1923), Box 23, G.E.B. Files.

[18] Harry H. Jones, "The Crisis in Negro Leadership" *Crisis*, 19 (March, 1920), pp. 256-59; George F. Peabody to James E. Gregg (April 5, 1920), Box 58, Peabody Papers.

[19] Peabody to Gregg, Ibid.; *Fisk University News* (September, 1919), pp. 2-4; W.E.B. DuBois to Robert B. Eleazer (March 12, 1926), Commission on Interracial Cooperation Collection, Trevor Arnett Library, Atlanta University.

[20] Jones (Ed.), *Negro Education*, pp. 310, 314-15; Flexner quoted in the General Education Board's Conference on Negro Education (November 29, 1915), p. 130; G.E.B. Files; Hope and DuBois letters in Herbert Aptheker (Ed.), *The Correspondence of W.E.B. DuBois, Volume I: Selections, 1877-1934* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1973), pp. 166-67.

[21] "Fisk University," a 1926 Memorandum in Box 138, G.E.B. Files; "Fisk Endowment Drive in Nashville," *Fisk University News* (May 1924), pp. 31-32; "First Million-Dollar Endowment for College Education of the Negro in the History of America," *Fisk University News* (October, 1924), pp. 1-13; The Commercial Club of Nashville to the General Education Board (January 24, 1920), Box 138, G.E.B. Files. Jones (Ed.), *Negro Education*, pp. 314-15, 320-21.

[22] Wolters, *The New Negro On Campus*, pp. 34-40, 49; *New York Times* (February 8, 1925), 2: 1.

86

[23] DuBois quoted in Wolters, *The New Negro On Campus*, pp. 62-63; "Fisk University." A 1926 Memorandum in Box 138 G.E.B. Files; For General Education Board's contributions see Fosdick, *The General Education Board*, pp. 329-332; "Fisk University," Report by Thomas E. Jones to the General Education Board (September 27, 1928) and (September 28, 1928), Box 138, G.E.B. Files.

IN PURSUIT OF FREEDOM: THE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF BLACK SOICAL ORGANIZATION IN PHILADELPHIA, 1900-1930

by

Vincent P. Franklin*
Assistant Professor
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign

The slave background of the black American has had a profound influence on many aspects of the contemporary black culture. The experience of slavery was a major component in the development of the rich and in many ways unique religious tradition of black Americans. The oral tradition in the form of folktales and spirituals had its roots in the not-so-peculiar institution.[1] At the same time, the fact that blacks were brought to this country as slave laborers to a large extent has defined the perceptions of other Americans about the character and capacities of black men. This twisted legacy is still with black Americans in the form of attempts to define the progency of the slave laborers as "culturally deprived or disadvantaged."[2]

The quest for freedom from slavery also has helped to shape several important black cultural traditions. Thus when one looks at the literature of black Americans, one cannot help but be struck by the recurrent themes of protest and liberation.[3] Education, which was often denied the slave by tradition and later through legislation, assumed a great importance to black Americans as a means through which one became liberated or liberated the minds of others. The three most important literary works by black Americans in the nineteenth century, David Walker's *Appeal*, Frederick Douglass' *Narrative of His Life*, and Booker T. Washington's *Up From Slavery*, all echo the theme of freedom through education. Schooling, both formal and informal, was judged to be the main thoroughfare by which blacks could leave "Babylon" and reach "Canaan-Land."[4]

For blacks in the North the slave background did not last as long as it did for their brothers in the South; thus the quest for freedom through education began in the early part of the nineteenth century. The possibility of receiving an education allowed these northern blacks to develop educational institutions which would be instrumental in the pursuit of freedom for blacks throughout the nation. Thus we find in Philadelphia in the 1820, and 1830, not only public and private schools for blacks, but also many community educational agencies and social organizations that were about the task of "freeing" black Philadelphians. In her study of the educational activities of black literary societies in the first half of the nineteenth century, Dorothy Porter provided a number of insights into the functioning of these organizations. Literary and debating societies, reading rooms, and lyceums sponsored lectures, published newsletters and antislavery tracts, and provided reading materials for their members and the Philadelphia community at large.[5] Many of these societies were founded by and for women who were interested in the dual issues of black advancement and the general moral reform of the community.[6] Although most of the societies were short-lived, they did serve a useful purpose in providing educational materials and activities for the Philadelphia black community.[7]

As the black population in the city increased throughout the period 1870-1900, there was a proliferation of social institutions and organizations in the black community. Du Bois described many of the social, secret, and cooperative organizations in his study of the Philadelphia Negro.[8] In the period after 1900, however, these organizations were even more numerous and their educational activities became multidimensional. Between 1900 and 1930 these social organizations played a major role in providing community-wide educational programs. In order to describe these educational activities we will divide them into three overlapping areas of concern: Education in the Black Heritage, Education in Black Social, Religious, and Fraternal Traditions, and Education for Social and Political Development. In the following discussion, we will briefly examine these three types of organized educational activities and the social organizations most active in sponsoring community education programs in black Philadelphia between 1900 and 1930.

Education in the black heritage

Most of the black social organizations and institutions to be discussed were active in the discovery and rediscovery of black History. Since the exploits of blacks and their contributions to the development of the nation were often not integrated into "American" History, it became necessary for black Americans to preserve and document their own history in the United States. Just as the rise of the black newspaper has been interpreted as a development that came about in order to fill a definite need of the black community, the rise of historical societies and organizations can be seen as an attempt to fill a gap in the black community's knowledge of itself.[9]

The earliest black historical organization in Philadelphia was the Reading Room Society founded in March, 1928. This was followed by the Benjamin Bannaker Institute in 1854. Both of these societies were primarily involved in providing reading materials for the "mental improvement" of the Philadelphia Negro.[10] The most ambitious and important historical undertaking of blacks in Philadelphia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was the formation of the American Negro Historical Society in October, 1897. Meeting at the Church of the Crucifixion, Robert Adger, Rev. Matthew Anderson, Rev. Henry L. Phillips, and several other prominent persons started the

89

Society in order to "collect relics, literature and historical facts in connection with the African Race, illustrative of their progress and development.[11] Coming together on the fourth Tuesday of every month, the members discussed historical materials unearthed by the individuals in the group. On December 28, 1897, a committee on the celebration of the Emancipation Proclamation reported on the preparations for the first public lecture to be sponsored by the Society. It took place on January 3, 1898, at Allen Chapel, Lombard Street above Nineteenth. Rev. J. C. Brock, a member of the group, spoke on "The Dawning of Liberty"; Rev. Matthew Anderson discussed "The Achievements of the Colored People in 25 Years of Liberty"; and Mr. William Baugh related the exploits of "The Colored Soldier."[12]

The public lectures of the American Negro Historical Society were to become an important forum for the education of Philadelphians into the black heritage from 1898 to 1923, when the Society ceased activity. During that period such illustrious black Philadelphians as Bishop Levi J. Coppin, John C. Asbury, Jessie Fauset, and William C. Bolivar were to lecture on historical and contemporary topics under the auspices of the Society.[13]

During and after the primacy of the American Negro Historical Society, several church and literary societies in black Philadelphia sponsored free lectures on various historical topics. The largest and most active of these groups were listed in the Philadelphia Colored Directories for 1908, 1910, and 1913.[14] These literary societies were usually made up of interested communicants from the various black churches. For example, the J. C. Price Literary Society was organized by the members of the Wesley A.M.E. Zion Church, and the Douglass Literary Society was associated with the Union A.M.E. Church in Philadelphia.[15] Other groups were not directly connected with churches, as was the case with the Paul Lawrence Dunbar Literary Society, and the Phillis Wheatley Literary Society, which was founded by Rev. Richard Robert Wright, Jr., for many years editor of the *Christian Recorder*, an official publication of the African Methodist Episcopal Church.[16]

One can gauge the amount and type of activities of these societies through a perusal of the *Philadelphia Tribune*, which usually published information on the groups in its religious columns.[17] One of the most active of these church literary societies during the period 1920-1928 was the Pinn-Memorial Literary Society. This organization not only sponsored lectures by its membership and other Philadelphians, but also worked with other groups to bring speakers to the city to give free public lectures, especially for the various celebrations of the black heritage.[18]

Commemorative celebrations of persons and events of great importance to black Americans were very successful educational activities in the black community of Philadelphia. Beginning with Emancipation Day, January 1, these celebrations were times when speeches and lectures informed the black community of its heritage and made clear the relationship between the past event and contemporary conditions. In the period 1920-1930, the Citizens Committee of Allied Organizations worked to make Emanicipation Day one of the most eventful of the entire year. Audiences of five hundred to five thousand were assembled at the Philadelphia Academy of Music or Tindley Temple, and heard such prominent speakers and musicians as Carl Diton (1920), James Weldon Johnson (1921), Emmett J. Scott (1924), Marian Anderson (1925), and Hallie Q. Brown (1926).[19]

The month of February was particularly eventful because of the celebrations of the birthdays of Abraham Lincoln (the twelfth) and Frederick Douglass (the fourteenth). Activities took place throughout the city and usually included public lectures and speeches on the contributions of these two great men to America.[20] Beginning in 1926, Negro History Week subsumed both of these dates under a more general celebration of black History. With the formation of the Philadelphia chapter of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History in 1927, a coordinated program of lectures and exhibits was available to all Philadelphians during the second week of February.[21]

Longer celebrations of the black American heritage took place in Philadelphia in 1913 and 1926. In 1913 the entire month of September was designated as a time to commemorate the "Fifty Years of Progress" of black Americans. An exposition was opened which emphasized the religious, economic, and political advancements of blacks since the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. Literally thousands of persons participated in the festivities which were planned and coordinated by blacks in Philadelphia.[22]

As part of the celebration of the Sesquicentennial of the United States, which took place in Philadelphia during the summer of 1926, blacks played an activie role in the planning and development of exhibits and educational programs. Although many problems arose, such as the threat of segregation at exhibits and facilities and the lack of sufficient state and local funding, on the whole, Philadelphia blacks were pleased with the recognition which they and all black Americans received through participation in this important exposition.[23]

Education in black social, religious, and fraternal traditions

While the historical and literary societies concentrated most of their educational activities on the general social, political, and economic development of Black America, the black social, religious, and fraternal institutions in Philadelphia were primarily involved in education for self-improvement and home and community development. The various women's clubs and organizations not only sponsored lectures on such topics as "The Accomplishments of Negro Womanhood" and "The Industrial Labor Problems of Colored Women," but also worked closely with the various social welfare agencies in the black community.[24] The Colored Women's Society for Organized Charity, The Allied Social Agencies Aid, and the most important group, the City Federation of Colored Women's Clubs, were intimately involved in the improvement of the social conditions of blacks in Philadelphia through education and charitable works.[25]

Many of the members of the women's clubs worked with the community centers and settlement houses in the city. The Eighth Ward Settlement House, the St. Simon Settlement, and later the Wharton Settlement House were very active in sponsoring activities of community development as well as educational and recreational programs for children and adults in the black community.[26] Though most of these centers were financed by the municipal government or philanthropic agencies in the city, the staffs were often made up of blacks with the knowledge and experience necessary to formulate a meaningful program of activities.[27]

The Sunday schools of the black churches were active in passing on the religious traditions of the various denominations to the children in their congregations. Teachers who usually had special training in the instruction of religious dogma held classes in the churches each Sunday morning. We have a very complete picture of the activities of these schools from the *Philadelphia Tribune* for the period 1912-1930. In its columns on "Church News" and "Churches and Their Pastors," the *Tribune* would publish information on the activities of these classes which was usually provided by the teachers or the pastors of the churches.[28] Beginning in June, 1924, the *Tribune* began publishing a weekly "Sunday School Lesson" prepared by Arthur Huff Fauset, then Principal of the Singerly Public School. This lesson usually consisted of a Bible story followed by a short religious commentary.[29] Special events which involved the Sunday schools, such as the Annual Sunday School Congress, were often reported in the religious section of the *Tribune*.[30]

The most thoroughly reported educational activities of the black religious community of Philadelphia, however, were those of the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) and the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA). The YMCA movement which began in England in 1844 was imported into the United States in 1852. The first Association for Negroes was started in Washington, D.C. in 1853. In the early years the activities of the organization centered on evangelism (preaching and sermons), Bible classes, and other religious observances for young adults. In later years (after 1885) the YMCA developed a four-fold purpose: to improve the physical, intellectual, social, and religious life of young men and boys.[31]

The earliest YMCAs for Negroes were mostly social and religious gatherings because they had no separate buildings and were usually confined to what was offered by the various churches in the communities. Beginning in 1912, however, several northern cities began to plan the building of colored YMCAs and were aided in this endeavor by generous contributions from the Rosenwald Fund. As a result, by

1938 there were forty-six separate Associations for Negro youth which were basically of two types: YMCAs with buildings and "non-equipment" YMCAs which carried on activities in local churches. Besides the various recreational and physical activities provided by the Ys, they also had extensive programs in adult education, crafts, Negro heritage clubs, Bible schools, art classes, and glee clubs. Many Negro YMCAs had important "extension programs" in order to provide activities for young men and boys who were not in close proximity to the main (Negro) branch.[32]

In Philadelphia the colored YMCA began functioning in 1889. By 1896, however, the disadvantages of not having a separate building had become apparent. W.E.B. Du Bois found that "the colored Y.M.C.A. has been virtually an attempt to add another church to the numberless colored churches in the city, with endless prayer-meetings and loud gospel hymns in dingy and uninviting quarters. Consequently the institution is now temporarily suspended. It had accomplished some good work by its night schools and social meetings."[33]

The campaign to erect a separate building for the colored YMCA was carried out during the first decade of this century. With assistance from the Rosenwald Fund, Rev. Henry L. Phillips and others were able to purchase a lot in South Philadelphia and construction of the building began in April, 1912.[34] Completed by January, 1914, the Southwest Branch (Christian Street) YMCA not only provided much needed recreational and educational activities for the large black community of South Philadelphia, but also served as social center and meeting place for black organizations from all over the city.[35] Under the leadership of Rev. Henry Porter, the Christian Street YMCA was one of the most important educational agencies in the black community throughout the period 1914-1930.[36]

The history of the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) to a very great extent parallels that of the YMCA. First established in England in 1855, the YWCA began operation in the United States in 1858 in New York City. By 1900 there were hundreds of Associations throughout the country and a national organization was formed in 1906. The first "colored" YWCA was opened in Dayton, Ohio, in 1893. After the formation of the national organization, a colored Secretary was appointed in 1913. The YWCAs also sponsored a number of activities to promote interracial understanding and cooperation.[37]

In Philadelphia the work of the YWCA among colored women began in 1902. Within a few years the organization acquired a separate building on Fifteenth Street in South Philadelphia.[38] The Southwest YWCA provided educational and recreational activities for women, and offered classes in various industrial and domestic arts, including dressmaking, millinery, crocheting, and knitting.[39] Also, the Southwest YWCA acquired a building for the lodging of single women and was active in seeking employment for its membership.[40] The Metropolitan (main) Branch in the city exercised a good deal of financial control over the Southwest YWCA and on several occasions conflicts arose.[41] After 1921, however, the Southwest branch launched campaigns to raise funds to allow it to remain relatively independent of the control and interference of the main branch in the city. As was the case with the YMCA the Southwest YWCA served as a social and convention center for the Philadelphia black community and sponsored numerous lectures and exhibits on black womanhood, black religious traditions, black artistic achievements, and many other popular topics.[42]

The various secret and fraternal organizations in black Philadelphia also played a significant role in the education of the community. The Knights of Pythias, the Odd Fellows, and most importantly the Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World (the Elks), sponsored educational activities such as public lectures and debates, not merely for their membership, but for the community at large.[43] In August, 1925, the Grand Lodge Session of the Elks passed a resolution "to provide scholarships for deserving Negro youths in the various Schools of Higher and Secondary Education . . . . In order to provide the funds necessary to granting of these scholarships . . . every subordinate lodge shall pay annually into the Educational Fund twenty-five cents for every member carried on its rolls."[44] These Elks scholarships were an extremely important source of financial aid for many black students even to the present day.[45]

Beginning in 1926, the Elks began to sponsor an "Educational Week" in which meetings were held and programs were presented in the Elks lodges throughout the country for the purpose of encouraging Negro youth to stay in school. At the second annual Educational Week in 1927, the Elks inaugurated the National Oratorical Contest in which cash prizes and scholarships were given to young black men and women who presented the best orations on the topic, "The Constitution of the United States.'[46] The various Elks lodges in Philadelphia participated in the local and regional oratorical competitions and received a great deal of enthusiastic support from the rest of the black community. Philadelphians were particularly pleased when a local boy, William Harvey III, was able to triumph over representatives from all over the nation in the oratorical contest for 1929.[47]

Delta Sigma Theta sorority and Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity were also active in promoting the schooling of black youth and in providing educational activities for the Philadelphia black community. The Deltas brought speakers to the city for free lectures and sponsored an annual Education Week similar to that of the Elks.[48] The annual "Go to High School--Go to College" campaign of Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity received a great deal of support from the membership of the organization in the various cities and towns throughout the country. The campaign in Philadelphia usually consisted of a week of activities for children and their parents stressing the benefits of secondary and higher education. Such prominent persons as A. Philip Randolph, Carter G. Woodson, Raymond Pace Alexander, and W.E.B. Du Bois spoke in the city during these educational campaigns.[49] There were, of course, many other social, religious and fraternal groups that sponsored educational activities for the black community during the period 1900-1930; however, this sampling of activities and organizations should provide some indication not only of the commitment of these groups to the passing on of their individual traditions to their membership, but also of their efforts to improve the entire black community through education.

Education for social and political development

Along with their regular social and political activities, many of the social development organizations in black Philadelphia involved themselves in community-wide educational activities. "The Philadelphia Association for the Protection of Colored Women" began in 1905 working with newly-arrived southern women interested in living and obtaining employment in the city. Although the primary objective of the Association was to support and protect these women from the "immoral influences" of the city, it also attempted to educate women intending to leave the South in such matters as industrial conditions, wages, opportunities, and competition that they would meet in northern cities.[50] Thus "education" was one of the specific goals of this organization for social improvement. The community at large was informed, almost on a monthly basis, of the activities of the organization through the *Tribune*; and rallies were held throughout the city in order to raise funds for its endeavors.[51] At these meetings speakers from all over the nation would discuss efforts of this group at self development and other issues pertinent to the social and moral improvement of black America.[52]

The Armstrong Association of Philadelphia, an interracial organization concerned primarily with the industrial and employment conditions for blacks in the city, often sponsored activities that not only informed the community of its work and progress, but also educated Philadelphians as to the general industrial conditions of the nation.[53] In 1912, for example, the Armstrong Association participated in a number of public meetings with the Legal Aid Society, Children's Aid Society, the Colored Methodist and Baptist Churches; and sponsored a series of rallies to raise funds for Tuskegee Institute, which brought Booker T. Washington to the city.[54]

In 1926 the Association organized classes in trade education at the Christian Street YMCA in order to prepare blacks for jobs in the skilled trades and construction industry in the city and sponsored "Negro in Industry Week" which was a drive to open up industries in the city to blacks.[55] The Association also worked as a liaison between the municipal Courts and Negro youths who were in trouble with the law and cooperated with social workers in dealing with many of the problems facing blacks in the city.[56] As National Urban League affiliate in Philadelphia, the Armstrong Association planned and coordinated the national convention of that organization when it was held in the city in 1928. Thus Philadelphians participated in the national efforts to inform Americans of the industrial conditions of the black population.[57]

The Philadelphia Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) through its annual membership drives and special lectures and conferences was one of the most important agencies for the education of the Philadelphia community, especially the black community, in the contemporary legal, political, and social conditions of black Americans. Organized in 1913, the Philadelphia Branch brought many speakers to the city to address audiences assembled at the Southwest YWCA, the Christian Street YMCA, and various black churches throughout the period 1913-1930.[58] Although it was not politically active before 1920, during the decade of the twenties the local NAACP participated in activities to protect the civil rights of black citizens and worked to bring an end to discrimination against blacks in the public schools, hotels, and other public places.[59] With the Citizens Republican Club, the Armstrong Association, and other organizations, the Philadelphia NAACP engaged in many activities for the social, political, and educational benefit of the black community.[60]

The separate public and Catholic schools for blacks in Philadelphia in spite of their many inadequacies did benefit the black community by serving as "social centers" and meeting places for black organizations. The Durham Public School and St. Peter Claver Catholic School in South Philadelphia and the Reynolds Public School in North Philadelphia opened their doors to a large variety of activities for community improvement.[61] One of the most successful annual events sponsored by the black public schools was "Negro Health Week." Exhibits were set up in the schools that stressed the benefits of a nutritional diet and dental hygiene. Mothers were advised about the care of their families and their homes, and, most importantly, doctors were available in the schools to give free checkups for tuberculosis and other diseases.[62] Also, the parent-teacher organizations of the black schools and the Citizens Committee for Regular School Attendance sponsored an annual "Friendship Week" which fostered interracial cooperation in the schools and community. In the first annual celebration in 1925, George Washington Carver came to Philadelphia and discussed his famous agricultural experiments at Tuskegee Institute.[63]

A great part of the above discussion of the educational activities of the black social institutions and organizations in Philadelphia is based on reports of these events in the *Tribune*, the most important black newspaper in the city during the period. But it should also be pointed out that the newspapers in general and the *Tribune* in particular were very important educational agencies for the black community. Although it began publishing in 1884, one can gain some understanding of the paper's emphasis on education and self-improvement by perusing the *Tribune* for the years that have survived (1912 to the present). Through its columns on "Negro History and Heroes" the *Tribune* provided the community with much information on the black heritage.[64] The sections of the weekly paper which were devoted to religious and fraternal news, and activities of the various social organizations made it an excellent repository of the traditions of these black social institutions. And the publicity given the social, economic, and political problems that blacks faced in Philadelphia as well as activities to try and improve these conditions, served to educate blacks and whites about the progress of black Philadelphians toward the basic goals of freedom and economic and political equality.[65]

In general discussions of northern black communities, historians have emphasized the constraints upon the black community in the development of effective organizations of social and political improvement. In contrast to the elaborate network of social and educational organizations and interest groups among whites, these historians conclude, blacks in northern cities have lived in "institutional ghettos."[66] But if the situation for blacks in Philadelphia during the period 1900-1930 can be considered in any way representative, there is a great deal of evidence to suggest that blacks had a large number of social organizations and which institutions not only worked to make the "ghetto" existence more humane and livable, but also were continuously involved in combating the prejudice and discrimination to which black Philadelphians were victim. The great emphasis placed on education by black Americans meant that the social organizations of the community would devote a great deal of their time and energies to providing educational activities for the general improvement and benefit of the members of that community.

Moreover, some sociologists in their discussions of black social institutions have dichotomized these groups into "race conscious" or "status conscious" organizations. Race conscious groups are those that are primarily interested in the betterment of the race as a whole. The NAACP, the National Urban League, the National Negro Business League, and similar groups would be considered by many sociologists to be "race conscious" organizations. Status conscious groups, however, would be those that have as one their implicit goals the increase in the status of its membership. Thus St. Clair Drake in his massive study of churches and voluntary associations in the Negro community of Chicago in the 1930s concluded that the "associations and churches thus become significant indices to economic class and status levels, and through sanctions they exert become the guardians of the standards of 'refinement' and 'respectability,' and the *modus vivendi* for upward social mobility."[67]

Though it was probably true that many of the members of the black social organizations in Philadelphia during the period 1900-1930 believed that their status (social class) in the community was enhanced by membership in this fraternal organization or that social club, it should also be pointed out that both status and race betterment organizations were involved in activities which sought to educate blacks about their heritage, their traditions, and their present conditions. Although with regard to the historical and literary lectures and programs it is difficult to determine exactly what impact these educational activities may have had upon individuals in the community, the public meetings, rallies, conferences, and conventions sponsored by many of these black social organizations for community education often times informed black Philadelphians of past and present activities and events, and educated them for future actions.

In the past the educational efforts of black social organizations have been ignored in discussions of the "black urban condition." However, this examination of the educational activities of the black social organizations in Philadelphia suggests that organized educational activities were important in the overall social development of urban black communities.

*I would like to acknowledge the financial assistance of a Spencer Fellowship from the National Academy of Education in completion of this paper.

NOTES

[1] For an excellent discussion of the relationship between the slave experience and contemporary black culture, see John W. Blassingame, *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), pp. 41-76. See also Houston A. Baker, Jr., *Long Black Song: Essays in Black American Literature and Culture* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1972).

[2] See Frederickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind*, pp. 320-32; William Ryan, *Blaming the Victim* (New York: Vintage Books, 1971), pp. 30-60, 112-36.

[3] For a discussion of the themes of protest and freedom in black writing, see Abraham Chapman, "Introduction," in *Black Voices: An Anthology of Afro-American Literature* (New York: Mentor Books, 1968), pp. 21-49; Arthur P. Davis, s,From the Dark Tower: Afro-American Writers, 1900-1940 (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1974). Cf. James Baldwin, "Everybody's Protest Novel," in *Notes of a Native Son* (New York: Beacon Press, 1955), pp. 9-17; Baker, pp. 42-83.

[4] In his essays, "Revolution and Reform: Walker, Douglass, and the Road to Freedom" and "Man and Institutions: Booker T. Washington's Up From Slavery," Baker discusses the theme of education and freedom, see pp. 58-95.

[5] Dorothy Porter, "The Organized Educational Activities of Negro Literary Societies, 1828-1846," *The Journal of Negro Education*, V (October, 1936), 555-74.

[6] One gets some idea of the concerns of these groups from their names, for example, in Philadelphia there was the Female Literary Society (1831), the Library Company of Colored Persons (1833), and the Philadelphia Association for the Moral and Mental Improvement of the People of Color (1835); see Porter, pp. 557-64.

[7] Ibid; see also, Leon Litwack, *North of Slavery: The Negro in the Free States, 1790-1860* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 181-86.

[8] Du Bois, *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study* (1899, reprinted New York: Schocken Press, 1967), pp. 221-34.

[9] For a discussion of the reasons for the rise of the Negro Press, see I. Garland Penn, *The Afro-American Press and Its Editors* (1891), reprinted, New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969), pp. 25-31.

[10] Porter, pp. 557-64; James Spady, "The Afro-American Historical Society: The Nucleus of Black Bibliophiles, 1897-1923," *Negro History Bulletin*, XXXVII (June-July, 1974), 254-55.

[11] Minutes of the American Negro Historical Society, October 25, 1897, MSS Box 20G, Leon Gardiner Collection, Historical Society of Pennsylvania (HSP).

[12] *Ibid.*, December 28, 1897; January 3, 1898.

[13] The public lectures offered by the American Negro Historical Society were often publicized in the *Philadelphia Tribune*, see February 12, 1912, n.p.; February 15, 1913, p. 2; March 8, 1913, p. 1; January 31, 1914, p. 5; August 8, 1914, p. 4; July 24, 1920, p. 1; July 31, 1920, p. 1; August 7, 1920, p. 1.

[14] *The Philadelphia Colored Directory–A Handbook of the Religious, Social, Political, Professional, Business and Other Activities of Negroes in Philadelphia, 1908*, compiled by R. R. Wright and Ernest Smith, 1908, pp. 28-50; *The Philadelphia Colored Directory, 1910*, pp. 20-35; *The Philadelphia Colored Directory, 1913*, pp. 18-23 (HSP).

[15] See, for example, *The Philadelphia Colored Directory, 1908*, p. 43.

[16] See *The Philadelphia Colored Directory, 1910*, p. 34.

[17] For discussions of these churches and literary societies, see the *Philadelphia Tribune*, January 12, 1912, p. 1; July 17, 1915, p. 1; June 10, 1916, p. 1; January 31, 1920, p. 9; September 25, 1920, p. 1; July 16, 1921, p. 1.

[18] For information on the lectures of the Pinn-Memorial Literary Society see the *Philadelphia Tribune*, October 16, 1920, n.p.; March 7, 1925, n.p.; February 16, 1928, p. 2. This society was sponsored by Pinn Memorial Baptist Church.

[19] *Ibid.*, January 10, 1920, p. 1; January 1 and 8, 1921, p. 1; January 5, 1924, p. 1; January 10, 1925, p. 1; January 9, 1926, p. 1.

[20] *Ibid.*, March 3, 1917, p. 1; March 1, 1919, p. 1; February 22, 1921, p. 1; February 19, 1921, p. 2; February 27, 1926, p. 15; February 19, 1927, p. 7.

[21] *Ibid.*, February 26, 1926, p. 1. For the formation of the Philadelphia Branch of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, see the *Tribune* November 17, 1927, p. 2. Negro History Week activities may be found in the *Tribune* on the following dates: January 12, 1928, p. 5; February 2, 1928, p. 16; January 23, 1930, p. 2.

[22] For coverage of the activities of the Exposition, see the *Tribune* July 12, 1913, p. 1; Septemoer 6, 1913, p. 1; September 20, 1913, p. 1; October 4, 1913, p. 1; October 18, 1913, p. 1.

[23] For black participation in the Sesquicentennial Celebration (1926), see the *Tribune*, February 13, 1926, p. 9; June 5, 1926, p. 5; June 12, 1926, p. 1; September 18, 1926, p. 5. See also, W.E.B. De Bois, "The Sesquicentennial Exposition," *The Crisis*, XXXIII (December, 1926), 65.

[24] *Philadelphia Tribune*, February 12, 1921, p. 1; April 19, 1924, p. 1; May 24, 1928, p. 3. See also Gerda Lerner, ed., *Black Women in White America–A Documentary History* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), pp. 440-58.

[25] For a five-year review of the activities of the Colored Women's Clubs in Philadelphia, see the *Tribune*, April 10, 1915, p. 1; May 8, 1915, p. 2. For the activities of the City Federation of Colored Women's Clubs, see February 24, 1917, n.p.; July 5, 1919, p. 1; July 12, 1919, p. 1; March 5, 1920, p. 1; November 6, 1920, p. 1.

[26] For specific information on the educational activities of the various community centers, see the *Tribune*, November 16, 1912, p. 1; March 8, 1913, p. 1; January 10, 1925, p. 3; May 16, 1925, p. 9.

[27] A very good example of this situation was the Wissahickon Boys Club, which worked with young men and boys in the black community and had a black staff led by William T. Coleman, but was financed primarily by members of the white community. See the *Philadelphia Tribune*, April 19, 1919, p. 1; April 2, 1927, p. 1. See also, Eugene Beaupre, "Negro Boy's Activities at Wissahickon (Boys Club), " *Southern Workman*, LVIII (September, 1929), 405-14.

[28] For the column "Church News," see the *Tribune*, January 6, 1912, n.p.; for "Churches and Their Pastors," see February 10, 1912, p. 3; and for the "Church Directory," see February 15, 1913, p. 2. All three were edited by Rev. Robert H. Peerce.

[29] *Ibid*., June 7, 1924, p. 9.

[30] *Ibid* , see, for example, January 27, 1912, n.p.; February 17, 1912, p. 4; March 16, 1912, p. 4; July 13, 1912, p. 6; August 10, 1912, p. 1.

[31] Jesse E. Moorland, "The Young Men's Christian Association Among Negroes," *The Journal of Negro History*, IX (April, 1924), 127-38; George Arthur, "The Young Men's Christian Association Movement Among Negroes," *Opportunity*, I (March 1923), 16-18; John Hope, "The Colored YMCA," *The Crisis*, XXXI (November 1925), 14-17.

[32] *Ibid*.; Campbell C. Johnson, "Negro Youth and the Educational Program of Y.M.C.A.," *The Journal of Negro Education*, IX (July, 1940), 354-62.

[33] Du Bois, *The Philadelphia Negro*, p. 232.

[34] *Philadelphia Tribune*, April 20, 1912, p. 2.

[35] *Ibid*., January 24, 1914, p. 1; see also, May 7, 1921, p. 6.

[36] The activities of the Christian Street YMCA were reported in the *Tribune* almost weekly throughout this period; however, detailed information may be found on the following dates: November 29, 1924, p. 1; October 31, 1925, p. 1; November 7, 1925, p. 1.

[37] Lerner, pp. 458-97; Channing Tobias, "The Work of the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations with Negro Youth," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CXL (November, 1928), 283-86; Marion Cuthbert, "Negro Youth and the Educational Program of the Y.W.C.A. *The Journal of Negro Education*, IX (July, 1940), 363-71.

Most of the above sources make note of the fact that the YWCA was more "interracial" than the YMCA, but no reason was given as to why this was the case. It probably was related to the fact that there was less competition and thus less possibility of conflict among whites and blacks in the YWCA. There were advantages to this situtation for black women in that they had access to greater funds through its connection with the "white" officials. However, the disadvantage was the increased control of the white administration over its activities. In Philadelphia this situation caused several problems; see the *Philadelphia Tribune*, October 18, 1913, p. 4.

[38] *The Philadelphia Colored Directory*, 1908, p. 47.

[39] *Philadelphia Tribune*, November 20, 1920, p. 7.

[40] *Ibid.*, November 6, 1920, p. 3; November 27, 1920, p. 1.

[41] The conflict with the Metropolitan Branch of the YWCA in Philadelphia was covered in the *Tribune* on the following dates: January 15, 1921, p. 1; January 22, 1921, p.; January 29, 1921, p. 1; October 1, 1921, p. 1.

[42] As was the case with the YMCA, the activities of the Southwest YWCA were reported on almost a weekly basis in the *Philadelphia Tribune*. But more detailed information may be found on: May 21, 1921, p. 8; June 4, 1921, p. 9; April 19, 1924, p. 7; May 17, 1924, p. 1; and July 25, 1925, p. 4.

[43] The *Tribune* has several columns of almost every issue devoted to the activities of the fraternal organizations in the city, see, for example, January 6, 1912, n.p.; January 27, 1912, n.p. See also, Du Bois, *The Philadelphia Negro*, pp. 221-26; Clara A. Hardin, *The Negroes of Philadelphia: The Cultural Adjustment of a Minority Group* (Bryn Mawr: Bryn Mawr College, 1945), pp. 130-32.

[44] Quoted in William C. Hueston, "A Forward Step in Fraternalism," *The Crisis*, XXXIV (July, 1927), 149.

[45] Scholarships for black students in Philadelphia, for example, were given out by the Fez Club of the Elks, formed in 1949 by Florence C. Franklin, and are still being offered; see "Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Philadelphia Fez Club, October 20, 1974" (pamphlet in possession of the writer).

[46] *Philadelphia Tribune*, June 9, 1927, p. 1; June 16, 1927, p. 1; July 7, 1927, p. 1.

[47] *Ibid*, April 25, 1929, p. 7; May 30, 1929, p. 1; September 5, 1929, p. 1.

[48] *Ibid.*, May 7, 1921, p. 1; May 28, 1921, n.p.; May 23, 1925, p. 9.

[49] *Ibid.*, April 12, 1924, p. 9; April 26, 1924, p. 9; July 19, 1924, p. 5; May 23, 1925, p. 1; May 30, 1925, p. 1; May 9, 1929, p. 1; May 16, 1929, p. 16.

[50] The Philadelphia Association for the Protection of Colored Women, *Report of the Fourth Year's Work, 1908* (Philadelphia: n.p., 1909), p. 1. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has the annual reports for 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, and 1915. It also possesses many of the flyers and bulletins of the organization.

[51] *Philadelphia Tribune*, January 6, 1912, n.p.; January 13, 1912, p. 1; February 10, 1912, p. 1; May 8, 1915, p. 2.

[52] Among the persons that spoke for the Philadelphia Association for the Protection of Colored Women were Chris Perry, editor of the *Tribune* (*Philadelphia Tribune*, April 12, 1919); Ernest Tustin, Philadelphia Director of Public Welfare (April 10, 1920); John C. Asbury, Representative in the Pennsylvania General Assembly (May 14, 1921).

[53] One can obtain some information on the activities of the Armstrong Association of Philadelphia from the Annual Reports, 1910-1920, which may be found at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

[54] Armstrong Association, *Fourth Annual Report*, 1912 (Philadelphia: "In a Negro Shop," n.d.), passim; *Philadelphia Tribune*, August 10, 1912, p. 1; December 7, 1912, p. 1.

[55] *Philadelphia Tribune* January 16, 1926, p. 1; March 13, 1926, p. 7; September 18, 1926, p. 9; October 2, 1926, p. 8; January 1, 1927, p. 1;

[56] *Ibid.*, Black and white social work trainees often served their apprenticeships with the Armstrong Association.

[57] *Ibid.*, April 12, 1928, p. 1. See also, Weiss *The National Urban League, 1910-1940* (New York: Oxford Press, 1974), pp. 176-202.

[58] For information on the rallies and membership drives of the Philadelphia NAACP, see NAACP Branch Correspondence, Philadelphia Branch, 1913-1930, Boxes G-186 and G-187, NAACP Collection, Library of Congress; and the *Philadelphia Tribune*, February 1, 1913, n.p.; December 30, 1916, n.p.; May 3, 1919, p. 1; February 7, 1921, p. 7.

[59] *Philadelphia Tribune*, March 15, 1924, p. 7; June 28, 1924, p. 1; August 23, 1924, p. 14; May 16, 1925, p. 1; February 20, 1926, p. 16; March 19, 1927, p. 7; May 31, 1928, p. 2.

[60] For examples of joint lectures and activities of the NAACP and other organizations in Philadelphia, see the *Tribune*, November 1, 1924, p. 9; January 24, 1925, p. 4; February 7, 1925, p. 5; May 23, 1925, p. 1; March 13, 1920, p. 2.

[61] *Ibid.*, January 30, 1915, p. 4; May 13, 1916, p. 4; September 18, 1920, n.p.; November 13, 1920, p. 10; for specific information on the activities of the "Colored Catholic Schools" in Philadelphia, see March 16, 1912, n.p.; June 12, 1912, p. 1; September 28, 1912, p. 1; February 8, 1913, n.p.; January 24, 1925, p. 2.

[62] *Ibid.*, February 28, 1920, p. 2; March 19, 1921, p. 9; June 25, 1921, p. 1; February 2, 1924, p. 4; February 27, 1926, p. 15; February 2, 1928, p. 12. See also, Hardin, pp. 89-90.

[63] *Philadelphia Tribune*, January 10, 1925, p. 6; February 14, 1925, p. 1; January 15, 1927, p. 9; April 23, 1927, p. 9; February 2, 1928, p. 2; January 30, 1930, p. 5.

[64] On April 24, 1920, p. 5, the *Tribune* began a regular column on "School and Community News." A series on "Christianity and Modern Life" began on August 23, 1924, p. 12. A regular column on Health Problems began on October 18, 1924, p. 9; and Negro History series were initiated on that date, and on May 16, 1925, p. 9. Extensive series on Negro Education started on August 22, 1925, p. 4, and October 2, 1926, p. 16.

[65] For a comprehensive history of the *Tribune* to that date, see the Fortieth Anniversary Issue, November 29, 1924.

[66] See Allan H. Spear, *Black Chicago: The Making of a Ghetto 1890-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967, chap. v,* "The Institutional Ghetto," pp. 91-110; Gilbert Osofsky, *Harlem: The Making of a Ghetto; Negro New York, 1890-1930* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), pp. 81-91, 150-58; Constance M. Green, *The Secret City: A History of Race Relations in the Nation's Capital* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967), pp. 176-83, 197-214.

[67] U.S. Works Progress Administration, Illinois, *Churches and Voluntary Associations in the Chicago Negro Community* (Chicago: Works Progress Administration, 1940), p. 219. (Mimeographed.) For other discussions of race versus status conscious organizations, see William O. Brown, "The Nature of Race Consciousness," *Social Forces*, X (October, 1936), 90-97; Elizabeth Ferguson, "Race Consciousness Among American Negroes," *The Journal of Negro Education*, VII (January, 1938), 32-40; H. Viscount Nelson, "Race and Class Consciousness of Philadelphia Negroes with Special Emphasis on the Years between 1927 and 1940" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1969); James P. Pitts, "The Study of Race Consciousness: Comments on New Directions," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXXX (November 1972), 665-87.

PART III

RECONSTRUCTIONISM AND THE IMPOSITION CONTROVERSY OF THE 1930's AND 1940's

GEORGE S. COUNTS AS AN IDEOLOGIST OF AMERICAN EDUCATION, The 1930s

Gerald L. Gutek
Loyola University of Chicago

This paper will examine the social and educational ideas which George S. Counts expressed in his well known *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?*, 1932, his *The Social Foundations of American Education*, 1934, and his *The Prospects of American Democracy*, 1938. Following Counts' own proclamation of cultural and educational relativism, these works were a response to the challenges raised by the economic Depression of the 1930s. This paper will argue that Counts served as an ideologist of American education during the Depression era.

In describing Counts as an ideologist of American education, I shall first stipulate a definition of ideology and then examine Counts in terms of that stipulated definition.[1] First, an ideology is contextual. Unlike a statement of abstract philosophy, an ideology is expressed at a particular time in response to the aspirations, needs, and problems of a particular group. Second, an ideology examines the past from a particular point-of-view. Although it may torture the past, it uses history in a presentist way to justify a contemporary program. In a highly selective manner, it garners its evidence to support a preconceived thesis. Using both myth and history, the ideologist fashions a version of how the present came to be. Third, an ideologist unlike the academic historian is an activist. Not merely concerned with explanation to illuminate the historical past, the ideologist uses history as a justification for pursuing a desired end or goal. History is used as evidence to support a theory of social change that suggests that society is tending in a particular direction. Fourth, after stating a theory of social change supported by historical evidence, the ideologist then becomes a programmatic in that he states a program or a platform that will lead to a preferred model of society.

During the Depression era, Counts in his speeches and writings on social and educational theory fulfilled the characteristics of an ideologist outlined above. First, his ideas were responses to the social, political, and economic context or situation of the 1930s. Second, he used the "new history" of Carl Becker and Charles Beard to fashion a particular version of the American past. Third, he suggested a theory of social change that postulated that American civilization was verging on a technological pattern that would be organized collectively. Fourth, Counts developed a program of action designed to facilitate the arrival of a new society that was democratic, technological, and collective in nature. The sections of the paper that follow will develop these four themes.

Counts and the Context of the Depression

On the first page of *The Social Foundations of Education*, Counts stated that:

> The historical record shows that education is always a function of time, place, and circumstance. In its basic philosophy, its social objective, and its program of instruction, it inevitably reflects in varying proportion the experiences, the condition, and the hopes, fears, and aspirations of a particular people or cultural group at a particular point in history.[2]

In "Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?," *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?, The Social Foundations of American Education,* and *The Prospects of American Democracy*, Counts was dealing with socio-educational issues in terms of the American situation of the 1930s and the circumstances of the Great Depression. In these works, Counts presented the following argument: (1) Naively, Americans traditionally had conceived of schooling as an all powerful cultural instrument that was intrinsically good. Americans had failed to realize that the school was only one of several educative agencies, and they also failed to realize that the school could be used for many social, political, and economic purposes. (2) The American people were experiencing an economic depression of catasthropic proportions that was producing severe social, political, and educational dislocations. (3) Instead of providing a statesmanlike leadership, American educators were failing to respond to the problems of the Depression. Many progressive educators were locked into a child-centered educational theory that caused them to refrain scrupulously from any attempt to deal consciously with major national issues. In the broader educational community, educators were either ignorant of socio-economic realities or were trying to be politically neutral. As a result, American educators tended to be either politically and socially agnostic or were unconsciously working to maintain the *status quo*. (4) In a time of national crisis, American educators could no longer be neutral, agnostic, or indifferent to the challenges raised by the Great Depression. Counts, then, challenged American educators with the task of creating an educational philosophy that would contribute to a new social order, when he said:

> I would consequently like to see our profession come to grips with the problem of creating a tradition that has roots in American soil, is in harmony with the spirit of the age, recognizes the facts of industrialism, appeals to the most profound impulses of our people, and takes into account the emergence of a world society.[3]

Creating the Tradition

Counts accepted his own challenge to "the problem of creating a tradition" for an American philosophy of education in both *The Social*

106

Foundations of Education and *The Prospects of American Democracy*. More accurately, he sought to identify a tradition in the American past that lent historical credence to his educational program and platform. In order to identify this tradition, Counts turned to a "new history" that has been written by Charles Beard and others. Beard and Counts were both members of the Commission of the American Historical Association on the Social Studies in the Schools. Counts was the Commission's Director of Research, and he and Beard developed a close personal friendship. Counts' *The Social Foundations of Education* was a companion volume to Beard's *A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools*.[4]

Counts examined the American cultural heritage and found it to be beneficiently free of medievalism, feudal dues, landed aristocracies, established churches, and social hierarchies. Unlike Europe, the United States was free of these conservative impediments of progress. The American heritage did, however, reveal two conflicting historical strains or rival traditions: Hamiltonianism and Jeffersonianism. According to Counts, Hamiltonianism was a political theory which advocated rule by an elite in favor of privileged persons pursuing special interests. With the rise of a capitalist industrial economy, Hamiltonianism took the modern form of economic individualism, ruthless exploitation of the environment, the exaltation of property and profit over persons, and a competitive socially atomist society.

In contrast to Hamiltonianism, Counts identified Jeffersonianism as an alternative tradition. Jeffersonianism and Jacksonianism had originated on the freehold of the independent farmer. Living and working in a basic economic, social, and political equality with his neighbors, the freehold farmer believed in a democratic polity that rested on a society of equals. As the United States industrialized after the Civil War, the Jeffersonian tradition was threatened by and came close to being submerged by the modern version of an ascendent Hamiltonianism that was personified by the exploitative capitalist or Robber Baron.

It was the Jeffersonian tradition–expanded by Jacksonianism, Populism, and Progressivism--that had contributed to the American democratic conception of the equality of persons. The egalitarian, democratic ethic was identified by Counts as a viable element in the American democratic heritage that needed to be preserved and transmitted to the oncoming generations of Americans by organized education in the United States.

A Theory of Social Change

Having identified equalitarian democracy as the ethical component to be preserved by transmission in the school, Counts developed a theory of social change that predicted--in very general terms--the direction in which American civilization was tending. Essentially, the United States was experiencing a cultural crisis as it moved from an agrarian and rural society to a technological social order that was industrialized, urbanized, and modernized. Because of industrialism, American civilization had been transformed from a loose aggregation of relatively self-contained rural households and small town communities into a mass society characterized by growing specialization and inter-dependence. The emergence of an industrialized and technological society not only effected the economic realm but it also had social and cultural repercussions. Science, technology, and invention had advanced far beyond society's reconstruction of ethical, legal, and political systems. The obsolescence of inherited conceptions of human nature, the rejection of traditional theological, philosophical, and political doctrines, and the rise of totalitarianism all reflected the anxiety of western man who found himself caught in profound social change. From the late 1920s until his death, Counts continually referred to the "Great Transition." In his *Prospects of American Democracy*, published in 1938, he wrote:

> We live in troublous times; we live in an age of profound change; we live in an age of revolution. ...Today we are witnessing the rise of a civilization quite without precedent in human history--a civilization founded on science, technology, and machinery, possessing the most extra-ordinary power, and rapidly making of the entire world a single great society.[5]

Counts' theory of social change postulated that western man had already experienced two stages of profound transition and was now in a third stage. The first stage was based on the natural arts of hunting, fishing, and trapping; the second depended on agriculture, handicrafts, and animal husbandry; the third stage was marked by science, industry, close integration, and extraordinary power.[6]

Profound social transition produced severe societal disequilibrium which manifested itself in historical events such as World War I and the Great Depression. Although bringing social turmoil and anxiety, such periods of profound change carried with them the promises of greater control over nature, and of increased material abundance, and of the liberation of man from the scarcity of a subsistence economy. Counts did not believe that it was either possible, or desirable, to seek to preserve the *status quo* or to "turn back the clock" to simpler but happier times. As one who shared and believed in the American progressive or liberal perspective--both in politics and in education--Counts believed that it was possible that the immense social, economic, political, and educational problems of the twentieth century could be solved in a way that would achieve the promise of American life. The time had come, he argued, to replace the competitiveness, the maldistribution, and the exploitation of the old capitalist society with a new co-operative and planning social order that would be humane, democratic, and technological. The new social order that Counts called for would preserve the democratic ethic by reconstructing it to meet the requirements of the new technology.

The Program

Unlike the academic historian, political scientist, or social philosopher who may devise theory, the ideologist needs to develop a program and strategies for implementing it to achieve his goals. For example in terms of concrete implementation of an ideology, we may judge an ideologist such as Robert Owen to be unsuccessful and may judge a Lenin or a Mao to be successful. What can we say of George S. Counts?

In reference to the Depression-era of the 1930s, Counts did develop what he called a "program of action," which he expressed in *The Prospects of American Democracy*. This program called for an affirmation of faith in the values and efficacy of democratic processes; dissemination of the knowledge needed by free men and women; the comprehensive and effective organization of the many; the maintenance of military and police power by legally constituted authorities; the guaranteeing of civil liberties; the systematic exposure of major campaigns of political propaganda; the conservation of the democratic temper; and the avoidance of war.[7]

Some of those who were sympathetic to Counts' *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* and to the general direction of his work in the 1930s indicated that they were inspired and provoked by his call but did not know what were the next steps or procedures to follow in implementing it.[8] In other words, a specific program for reconstruction was never developed nor was an organization formed to lead to the creating of a new society. Neither did Counts associate himself in a formal sense with those who called themselves Social Reconstructionists in educational philosophy.

In his personal life, Counts was decidedly an activist. For example, he sought and won the Presidency of the American Federation of Teachers in 1939. He was the senior editor of the *Social Frontier* from 1934 to 1937. He later was the Liberal Party candidate for the United States Senate in 1952. However, his programmatic efforts were limited in both scope and in implementation when compared to the magnitude of the challenge that he presented to educators in *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?*

It is likely that Counts felt that many of the issues that he had raised in the early years of the Depression had been dealt with by the social policies of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal and later by Harry Truman's Fair Deal. After some initial criticism of Roosevelt's lack of comprehensive policy for national planning and reconstruction in the 1932 campaign for the Presidency, Counts came to support and to defend the New Deal. In *The Prospects of American Democracy*, he attacked the Supreme Court's obstruction of New Deal legislation and condemned the anti-Roosevelt Liberty League as a refuge of the special economic interests.

Counts was operationally as well a theoretically a cultural relativist in education. When the national priority moved from the problems of economic depression to the defense of democracy against Fascist and Nazi totalitarianism during World War II, Counts' attention also moved in that direction. In the Cold War era, his expert knowledge of Soviet society and education took on a new relevance as he explained Soviet political and educational policies to an American audience.

In conclusion, what were some of George S. Counts' long range and lasting contributions to American education? He clearly pointed out that education was related to a given civilization and its problems at a given time in history. He argued forcefully that organized education could be an instrument of broad and significant national policy. He challenged educators to be educational statesmen who made policy rather than having the dictates of others imposed on them. He anticipated much of the current theorizing that is being done on modernization and its educational consequences. He demonstrated that educational philosophy was not a completed product but rather an instrument for dealing with changing issues in a changing world.

NOTES

[1] The outline of the stipulated definition of ideology used in this paper is drawn from the following sources: Normand R. Bernier and Jack E. Williams, *Beyond Beliefs: Ideological Foundations of American Education* (Englewood Cliffs: N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973); Arthur J. Newman, "Ideology: A Necessary Tool for Understanding International Political Dynamics," *The International Foundations of Education Quarterly*, I (November 1974), 11-18; John Plamenatz, *Ideology* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970).

[2] George S. Counts, *The Social Foundations of Education* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), p. 1.

[3] George S. Counts, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* (New York: John Day Co., 1932).

[4] Charles A. Beard, *A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932).

[5] George S. Counts, *The Prospects of American Democracy* (New York: John Day Co., 1938), pp. 37-38.

[6] George S. Counts, *Social Foundations*, p. 13.

[7] George S. Counts, *Prospects*, p. 353.

[8] Gerald L. Gutek, *The Educational Theory of George S. Counts* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1970), pp. 62-73, 125-134.

GEORGE S. COUNTS AND THE IMPOSITION CONTROVERSY

George J. Dixon
Ohio State University

George S. Counts was born December 9, 1889 on a farm in northeastern Kansas, the third of six children in a strict Methodist family. Later in his life, Counts saw as significant the fact that this childhood of rural schoolhouse and long farm chores occurred during the decade characterized by Henry Steele Commager as "the watershed of American history." During this period the nation was shifting from a predominantly agricultural civilization to one that was predominantly urban and industrial. And although Counts successfully made the transition in both his personal life and his professional concerns, he maintained until his death in 1974 a love for the land, claiming in 1969 "that in a certain sense I am a Shintoist – a worshipper of nature."[1]

The farm experience might also be seen as an early influence on Counts' later pedagogical concerns, for on the farm the interaction of human muscle and ingenuity with the surrounding environment was immediately discernible to the child. From his earliest years, the farm child had progressively greater responsibilities, so that the development of skills and moral character was never abstract. But after the nation passed over that cultural watershed, the gap between school and life widened. And the question which then grew in importance -- Where are our children going to be and what are they going to do? -- seldom received the attention it deserved. To the end of his life Counts contended that "the traditional school does not and perhaps cannot provide the answer to this question."[2] One might thus see much of Counts' work as a life-long struggle with the various aspects of this fundamental need for educational direction.

In 1911, Counts graduated with a B.A. in classics from Baker University in Baldwin, Kansas, graduating (as he humbly remembers) at the head of his class. After two years of high school teaching he enrolled at the University of Chicago because "it was regarded at that time as a champion of radical ideas in the fields of biology, social science, philosophy and theology."[3] Although Counts was persuaded by Charles Hubbard Judd, dean of the School of Education, to take a degree in education, the courses Counts took in sociology, anthropology, economics and political science outnumbered his credits in the School of Education. As a result, Counts graduated from Chicago in 1916 without the minor in psychology that Judd typically encouraged in students of education. Judd's influence may be evident in Counts' dissertation topic, "Arithmetic Tests and Studies in the Psychology of Arithmetic," but thereafter Counts focussed his research and writing on the relation between education, culture and society.

In Counts' special combination of interests one might expect to find the influence of Thorstein Veblen, especially since Veblen had spent fourteen years at the University of Chicago (1892-1906) writing and teaching economics. Indeed, much of Counts' work in the 1920's could be seen as variations on those wide-ranging economic critiques, particularly on Veblen's study of the business world's domination of American universities in *The Higher Learning in America* (1918). As studies of class bias and privilege, Counts' best known early work, *The Selective Character of American Secondary Education* (1922) and *The Social Composition of Boards of Education* (1927), show the additional influence of historian Charles Beard. In retrospect, it was Beard and John Dewey that Counts acknowledged as major contributors to his intellectual development, even though he was never formally a student of either man.[4]

These two works of the 1920's established Counts' name in the field of education, although his sociological emphasis seemed out of step with the prevailing Progressive focus of that era. The child-centered tradition, with its reliance on a psychological foundation for pedagogy, over-shadowed the sociological aspects of education until at least the onset of the Depression. Then, as Cremin notes, "radicalism no longer seemed passe, . . . Socially conscious notions of progressive education, disparaged by the avant garde of the twenties as conformist moralizing, now seemed very much to the point."[5]

This change of climate coincided with Counts' 1928 Inglis Lecture, *Secondary Education and Industrialism*, which summarized the position he was to maintain throughout the educational controversies of the 1930's, namely, that American education suffered from "the absence of any vigorous and concerted effort to discover the educational implications of the new industrial civilization which is rapidly overwhelming and transforming the traditional social order."[6]

Counts' most dramatic presentation of this position occurred at the 1932 Progressive Education Association convention in Baltimore, where he issued his famous challenge, "Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?" Cremin reports that the assembled educators were stunned by Counts' direct charge of educational aimlessness and immediately suspended the next day's schedule in order to consider the challenge. After a day's debate, the convention's response (as might be expected) was to form a Committee on Social and Economic Problems with Counts as chairman.

For the next two years, Counts and the Committee tried unsuccessfully to formulate a position that would allow the PEA membership to come to grips as professional educators with the problems of the Depression. The story of the Committee's repeated frustration is recounted in *Transformation of the School* by Lawrence Cremin, who connects the lack of PEA decisiveness with the decline and eventual disbanding of the organization. Counts had apparently articulated a question that went to the heart of the progressive educator's problematic relationship with American society.

But Counts wisely did not confine his efforts to committee work. He continued to issue his challenge to other groups of educators in a series of speeches published under the title *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* Here he added to his critique of the child-centered myopia of prevailing progressive practice his stance in what became known as the "imposition controversy." In brief, he contended that schools could never be neutral on the great social questions of the day and that educators had an obligation to add their efforts, both in and out of the classroom, to the great work of social and economic reconstruction that faced the United States during the 1930's. For the schools to attempt neutrality on these burning issues by ignoring them or by divorcing them from actual life was, in Counts' view, to give the rising generation the false impression that the democratic ideal had been fulfilled in the United States.[7] In the face of the glaring gaps between this ideal and actual Depression conditions, this "neutral" position was, in Counts' view, a reactionary one.

The depth of the reconstruction that Counts was advocating is evident on the title page of the first issue of *The Social Frontier*, a journal that grew out of the discussions of a group of educators at Teachers College, Columbia University. On that October 1934 cover, editor Counts juxtaposed two quotations, one from the Declaration of Independence and another from the report of another committee for which Counts was research director, the Commission on Social Studies of the American Historical Association. The inalienable rights named in the 1776 Declaration could be extended to the majority of American citizens, it seemed, only by a collectivist society: "The age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and a new age of collectivism is emerging."[8] According to Counts' introductory editorial remarks, the schools were to be one of the primary tools for establishing in the public mind these new collectivist means to traditional democratic ends.

The controversy over what and how the school should impose on children this revised view of American society was formally launched in the January 1935 issue of *The Social Frontier*. There six spokesmen for various political and pedagogical persuasions responded to the questions posed by the editors: Should school be used to influence positively attitudes flavoring one or another type of social living? If yes, in what direction? In what manner? Where do class divisions, respect for personality, propaganda techniques fit into your analysis?

The responses covered, as might be expected, a broad spectrum, ranging from Catholic through Fascist and Communist positions to more progressive statements by George Coe and Boyd Bode. Four of the six respondents agreed on the need for schools to impose one or another position, although Boyd Bode refused to agree with the need for imposition, at least in the sense proposed by Counts. Bode contended that to impose a particular view on a student would place the progressive educator in a self-defeating position, no matter how worthy the ends in mind nor how desperate the prevailing social conditions. To use imposition or indoctrination as a means of educating would defeat the ultimate goal of education -- the development of open and questioning intelligences. Instead, Bode suggested that

> The remedy for the progressive education movement is not to prescribe beliefs, but to specify the areas in which reconstruction or reinterpretation is an urgent need. If this point is covered, we can afford to take the position that the teacher has fulfilled his obligations if he provides the conditions for sincere and careful thinking, without assuming responsibility for the outcome.[9]

It was on the basis of Bode's questioning of ends and means that the imposition controversy continued during the 1930's in the pages of *The Social Frontier.* Counts immediately responded with an editorial which seemed to go well beyond the position articulated by Bode:

> *The Social Frontier* consequently proposes to the teachers of the country that they ally themselves with that conception of social welfare which may be expected to serve the many rather than the few -- that they strive to substitute human for property rights, a democratic collectivism for an oligarchic individualism in economy, social planning and security for anarchy and chaos. Positively and consistently they should seek to develop in the population those values, attitudes, ideals, and loyalties consonant with the new way of life, as well as habits of thought and action calculated to bring that way of life into being.[10]

In March 1935, John Childs joined the imposition debate and subsequent discussions centered around the positions alternately defined by Bode and Childs during the next four years. Childs' basic position was that society's (and thus the school's) most urgent problems were economic; that school neutrality was impossible; that each teacher had a duty to weight his classroom presentation in favor of reforms that would make all aspects of American life, even work itself, liberating for every individual. Bode countered that economics provided a narrow base for social criticism and reform; that teachers had no special mandate to select, much less impose, the goals of a society; and that confusion about ends and means could make "imposed" education anything but a liberating experience.[11]

Other well-known educators joined the discussion: John Dewey in a May, 1937 article entitled "Education and Social Change": Theodore Brameld in May, 1938. As Dewey (among others) pointed out, the imposition debate was becoming more and more an internal fight among progressive educators over the ends/means distinction, with little detectable input from outside the small but influential Teachers College group. This infighting prompted a protest called "A Layman Speaks His Mind" from a journalist named Forrest Allen, who first asked the question, "Why is it that the most important educational accomplishments of the New Deal – *if* you are willing to grant that there have been any educational accomplishments -- have had nothing to do with professional educators?" After deploring the lack of political savvy among educators, Allen concludes with this advice: "Frankly, I think you have to carry your fight outside of your own precincts -- and above all, tell that man-in-the-street what it's all about. Until you do, you haven't a cause; not even a lost one."[12]

Perhaps it was this progressive infighting that led Counts away from the editing of *The Social Frontier* to more practical interests. With his departure from the editorship in 1937, there disappeared from the journal his occasional attempts to balance the serious discussions of those troubled times with some humor and self-effacement. (See, for example, Counts' publication of a "safe speaker" list which included Kilpatrick and Bode in the October, 1935 issue.) With the taking over of *The Social Frontier* by the John Dewey Society and the transfer of editorial responsibilities to George Hartmann, the characteristic tone of the Counts' year faded. In the case of the imposition controversy, the debate became less good-natured, sometimes even bitter. In addition to this, the discussion took on a tone of philosophical technicality that Counts apparently had little interest in.

Instead, Counts was enjoying his third tour of the Soviet Union (1936), continuing to write on education and society (*The Prospects of American Democracy*, 1938) and becoming politically active in the American Federation of Teachers, an organization he would head from 1939 to 1942. During this time, the rise of authoritarian regimes in Europe was no doubt working on Counts' attitude toward democratic education, economics and politics. He never recanted his original positions on imposition and the reconstruction of American society, but a change of perspective is discernible in a short article published in his old journal now called the *Frontiers of Democracy* and edited for the PEA by William Kilpatrick) in May 1941.

In response to the question "Have your views on politics (broadly conceived) significantly changed?" Counts affirmed in summary form his 1932 position on school, society and imposition, but noted that his whole attitude had been "considerably modified" since then. Three factors seem principally responsible: 1) a discovery of the potentially disastrous effects on democracy of military power, so that "arbitrary and capricious rule by military power is far more dangerous to popular liberty today than it was in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries," 2) a recognition, perhaps aided by the imposition debate, of the inter-relatedness of the ends and means involved in the search for a democratic society, and 3) a reaffirmation of the integrity of the individual in a successful democracy, which "requires the wide acceptance and practice of the so-called 'bourgeois virtues.' The weakness of the terms, of course, is not that these virtues are bourgeois, but rather that the bourgeoisie so often fail to practice them."[13]

This may seem to be a rather tame position for the author of *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* But it was a position conditioned by the rise of totalitarianism and the onset of war in Europe, and by the ending of the Depression in the United States. For a while at least, the most urgent problems of American society and education would not be economic; at the same time the immediate military and ideological struggles provided a clear aim for education. The gap between school and life seemed to be closing, at least in 1941. Thus even the educational combatants of the imposition controversy followed Counts' earlier shift of interest. The imposition question faded from the pages of *The Frontiers of Democracy* and was replaced by discussions of American education and the war effort.

This is not to say that the discussion sparked by Counts in 1934 was in vain. Counts himself may not have been interested in the intricacies of the debate as it later developed between Childs and Bode, but some of the issues involved in the relation of school to society were clarified by the exchanges. To ask for more than clarification of the problem might be unrealistic, since the issue seems to go to the heart of society's self-concept and is thus in perennial need of re-examination. To insist on a final resolution may be to seek a non-progressive answer for one of the main questions raised by the progressive education movement. For central to that movement is a belief that through continuous questioning a society can agree upon values that are neither handed down from on high nor left completely to the whim of individual interpretation.

One might, in fact, see behind much of the debate over imposition among progressive educators the difficulty they had balancing between these two alternatives. In his own attempt to balance between formalism and nominalism, Counts placed his hope in the grass-roots combination of stability and flexibility in individual teachers. He seemed to have little interest in nice distinctions between "imposition," "indoctrination" and "inculcation," terms which served as ammunition for the five-year long debate among progressive educators. For Counts, the "position" involved in imposition was more of a practical necessity for anyone attempting to teach than it was a philosophical conundrum. For Counts seemed to contend that unless the act of teaching was rooted in one more or less evident stance or another, the gap between school and life would remain unbridged. In our urban and industrial world, it was up to the teacher to embody that "ideal factor in culture which gives meaning, direction, and significance to life."[14] Without that discernible personal commitment on the part of the teacher, the process of teaching and learning would remain a mere intellectual exercise:

> The process of education, if it goes beyond mechanical training and conditioning, is peculiarly personal and intimate. In a democracy, certainly, the teacher must first of all be a person of dignity, worth, and character - master of himself and an individual of moral stature. To make him a hireling or a lackey of

> a community bully, a political boss, or an owner of property is to destroy him. Anything that tends to make teachers subservient and slavish should be opposed by every friend of American education. Today, unfortunately, there are altogether too many teachers in the schools who do not dare to speak their minds either inside or outside the classroom. This is the real educational tragedy of a time that requires a generation capable of clear, courageous, and creative thinking.[15]

It was in this ideal of teacher as a model of courage and character tha Counts seemed to put his final trust.

NOTES

[1] "A Humble Autobiography," in *Leaders in American Education*, ed. Robert J. Havighurst (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), p. 154.

[2] Ibid., p. 153.

[3] Ibid., p. 158.

[4] Ibid., p. 170.

[5] Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1969), p. 227-228.

[6] George S. Counts, *Secondary Education and Industrialism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929), p. 3.

[7] *The Social Foundations of Education* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), p. 552.

[8] *The Social Frontier*, October, 1934.

[9] *The Social Frontier*, January, 1935, p. 22.

[10] Ibid., p. 31.

[11] See Bode's reply in *The Social Frontier*, November, 1935; the Childs-Bode exchange of November, 1938; Bode's reply of January, 1939. Childs' review of Bode's *Progressive Education at the Crossroads* in May, 1938 also enters the controversy.

[12] *The Social Frontier*, January, 1937, pp. 143-145.

[13] *The Social Frontier*, May, 1941, pp. 231-232.

[14] George S. Counts, "Should the Teacher Always Be Neutral?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, December, 1969, p. 187.

[15] George S. Counts, *The Prospects of American Democracy* (New York: John Day Company, 1938), p. 313.

THE BODE-CHILDS IMPOSITION CONTROVERSY: THE CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES OF THE PARTICIPANTS

James DiGiambattista
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

In the October 1934 issue of *The Social Frontier* John Dewey writes of how the teaching profession will participate in reconstructing a new social order. He is careful to distinguish between the political decisions teachers must make about what they will teach and the role of the school curriculum in social reconstruction. Teachers as a professional group will have to make the initial decisions about what to teach. ". . . (T)he educator in respect to the relation of educational work to present and future society is constantly compelled to make a choice."[1]

Dewey looks to the teaching profession to make the most responsible choices on the basis of empirical evidence. "The chief evil is that the choice is to often made unconsciously by accommodation to the exigencies of immediate pressure . . ."[2] Theirs must be a wise political decision based in experimental intelligence that has a high probability of expressing the collective trend in American society during the depression era. He relies on teachers to stand in support of this democratic collective trend and against unrestricted economic individualism. As a group, Dewey feels they are capable of experimental intelligence and can objectively assess social trends and specify curriculum goals that will lead to the further development of this social movement. Dewey writes,

> I do not think that the schools can in any literal sense be the builders of a new social order. But the schools will surely, as a matter of fact and not of ideal, share in the building of the social order of the future according as they ally themselves with this or that movement of existing social forces.[3]

Once teachers have made this political choice Dewey feels there is no need to include political goals in the structure of the curriculum. He urges teachers to take a political stance based in experimental intelligence hoping that they will see a need to teach experimental intelligence in the schools. Experimental method will become the organizing principle of the school curriculum and social action will result from an intersubjective assessment of values and definition of social needs that arises from experimental method. In Dewey's words, teachers will be "laying the basis, intellectual and moral, for a new social order. . . ." Changes in the school curriculum do not lie in the realm of political decisions. Rather, those people capable of making sound political deicisons, in this case teachers, are advised to institutionalize that method in the schools.

Dewey has removed learning that goes on in the schools from the sphere of political action. In terms of social reconstruction, the most the school curriculum can hope to accomplish is to teach students an experimental method for making value decisions based on factual information. The school should not teach students how to take action on value decisions. How students deal with political and economic conditions is either the product of intersubjective agreement on societal needs and values or action that conforms to the stated aims of a democratic society. Dewey's solution to social reconstruction via the school curriculum avoids the problem of nominalist versus formalist conceptions of education for political action. It avoids dealing with the issue at hand by equating experimental intelligence with social reconstruction. Consequently, it falls into both philosophic camps.

Although his position on the school's role in social reconstruction did not articulate the problem clearly for future discussion, it did define the two philosophic positions that would characterize the Bode-Childs controversy in *The Social Frontier* over the role of the school in social reconstruction. That debate centers around curriculum issues, how learning outcomes should be transferred to the realm of social action and implications this holds for teaching experimental intelligence. The initial springboard for the discussion was *The Report of the Commission on Social Studies* chaired by George Counts. The proceedings of the Commission were published in *Education as Statecraft* and reviewed in the pages of *The Social Frontier* by John Childs.

Childs felt the most valuable aspect of the Commission's work was to discredit three dominant movements in modern education which advocated the position that education could be made an

> . . . autonomous undertaking that can be managed successfully apart from a definite social outlook and a frame of reference embracing things educators deem "necessary, possible, and desirable" in the American social order.[4]

Childs believed public education should develop insightful individuals who can create practical solutions to social problems as they develop. He goes on to laud the Commission because "it does not believe these individuals can be developed in a social vacuum, or apart from an understanding of the compulsions, conditionalities, and possibilities of our industrial society. . . ."[5]

The Bode-Childs debate quickly centers around the issue of how to best educate students for social action. Both educators wanted to avoid nominalist (lack of an extra-personal value base) and formalist (ideological) solutions. The limits of experimental intelligence as a context for social action become the subject of Childs' criticism; Bode defends experimental method as the only philosophical alternative to a nominalist-formalist dualism.

Childs, in his early articles, is concerned with the urgent need for educators to make choices about what is "necessary, possible, and desirable' for American society to begin the process of social reconstruction. He believes that, for the progressive educator, a political choice or frame of reference is a necessary condition for social action. Exactly what political position that frame of reference takes is not important to Childs so long as a choice is made and the teacher can begin educating for social reconstruction. His early articles are aimed at moving the teacher into the sphere of political decision-making.

> The teaching profession hiding behind no legal fiction and taking dictation from no special group or class, however powerful and respectable, is under obligation to conceive its task in terms of the widest and most fundamental interests of society, ever seeking to advance the security and quality of living of all the people.[6]

Childs recognizes the need for educators to experimentally and scientifically assess the interests of a democratic society. In Childs' view, any act presupposes such a definition of values. "Action inevitably involves choice. An act is undertaken in order to secure certain outcomes and to avoid certain others."[7] Unless such a definition is reached by experimental intelligence it is bound to be a reactionary set of political values. Childs is not interested in destroying political pluralism, but in encouraging political adherents to clarify their own value positions and formulate the problem of democracy in its widest sense.

For Childs, formulating the problem of democracy does not describe the process of political decision-making. In a backhanded way he quotes John Dewey in support of his position. "In his *Democracy and Education*, Dr. Dewey suggest . . . a difference in theory which does not make some concrete difference in educational practice is a formal difference, he contends, with little significance."[8] Apparently for Childs, experimental intelligence can provide an empirical basis for making feasible political decisions, but the concept does not deal adequately with the question of value as a context for social action.

In his article "Education and Social Reconstruction" Bode begins addressing the question by pointing to the dualism between American economic life and democratic social values as the cause of continued unrestricted economic individualism. He feels that the process of valuation has been separated from industrial development; the result is that individuals care only for personal gain and neglect consideration of societal needs. For Bode, the first step in social reconstruction is extending social values and concerns to American economic life. He warns that,

> A program of social reconstruction which does not tie up directly with a new conception of values so as to provide incentives and

> direction for this reconstruction, perpetuates the old dualism and so carries within itself the germs of its own defeat.[9]

Bode believed that moral and social values grew from within man and ideals and standards were shaped in an experimental fashion. ". . . (T)he everyday affairs of practical life become the generating source of these values, and the Protestant dictum that every man is his own priest takes on a new meaning."[10]

For Bode, the goal of education is the reconstruction and resolution of contradictory beliefs the individual acquires by living in society. ". . . (T)he teacher has fulfilled his obligations if he provides the conditions for sincere and careful thinking, without assuming responsibility for the outcome."[11] The classroom becomes a ground for scientific investigation, and solutions to social problems are based in changing social needs.

During his series of exchanges with Childs, Bode never discusses how values that grow from within are translated into political decision-making. He chooses to isolate schooling from social action. "The bearing of education on social reconstruction is indirect rather than direct. It is never detached or neutral."12 However, Bode lacks a methodology for explaining how values are translated into social action. As Childs would later contend, Bode's separation of schooling from political decision-making becomes a formal distinction. By suspending the school between nominalism and ideology Bode has substituted a formalist methodology for the facts of everyday experience. His claim for experimental intelligence, that "it is indoctrination in the belief that indoctrination of beliefs is wrong," is unjustified.

In "Professor Bode on 'Faith in Intelligence'" Childs objects to Bode's theorizing because it defines "the effort to use the schools to inculcate a definite social outlook incompatible with the effort to use the schools to promote. . . the liberation of intelligence."[13] In formulating his position Bode stresses that any educator who has grasped the essences of democracy will not try to develop a common frame of reference for his students. Here Childs begins asking Bode for an operational definition of experimental intelligence. Childs challenges that,

> . . . it is one thing to say that beliefs and values grow from within our human experience and should be wholly relative to what that experience validates, and it is another and quite different thing to say that these beliefs and values grow spontaneously in each childish breast by a process of unfolding from within or that they are inevitably to be acquired by chance interactions of the child with. . . society.[14]

He asks Bode to define the operational link between valuation and Bode's conception of experimental intelligence i.e., how does valuation necessarily proceed from experimental intelligence? In short, how do Bode's claims for experimental method bear themselves out in classroom practice?

Childs contends that Bode's separation of ends and means is only a formal distinction and that valuation by experimental intelligence doesn't occur until the youngster is given some frame of reference for solving social problems. While Bode admits that there is no neutrality on the issue of individual or collective society, in Childs view Bode isolates the school curriculum from social action and in doing so gives his blank check to the confused values a child acquires in his everyday interactions with society. With good reason Childs asks "to what extent is this extremely individualistic conception of the educative process the correlative of our historic policy of laissez-faire and economic individualism?"[15] For Childs the responsibility for social reconstruction via the schools lies with teachers who can exercise experimental intelligence to make sound political decisions about social needs.

During the exchanges which follow in the pages of *The Social Frontier* Bode never really deals with Childs' contentions, but merely restates his philosophic position as if the correctness of his analysis was self-evident. In "Dr. Bode Replies" Bode reviews his attempts to go beneath the social-economic dualism in American political thinking by reopening the whole question of values. Perhaps the problem with Bode's proposal is that it deals with the school by isolating it from all other patterns of social relationships. Bode's discussion of education versus indoctrination is too narrowly experimental because it divorces the process of valuation from the context in which it proceeds. Consequently, when Bode turns his attention to the school curriculum his analysis begins with a formalist position.

In May of 1936 John Dewey entered the Bode-Childs controversay with an article called "Class Struggle and the Democratic Way." He hoped to clarify some of the points being discussed. Dewey insisted that facts and the organization of facts as a context for action were two separate problems.

> . . . I do not see . . . that the concept of the class struggle is the one which will give educators the intellectual and practical direction they need. . . . To know the empirical facts is one condition of experimental method; but the question of what to do about the facts and how to do it is another matter.[16]

The problem with his position is that he separates facts and how facts are constituted, but fails to reformulate the dilemna. Presumably both Childs and Bode were interested in how facts participate in value positions.

What is most interesting about Dewey's article is that he attacks Childs for taking a Marxist-Leninist position but does not try to critique the issues Childs raises from an experimentalist point of view. Like Bode, he sees Childs only as a Marxist and ignores the argument Childs makes for the need for a frame of reference if valuation is to occur. If Childs is a Marxist his position on facts and valuation as a context for action is inconsistent with his political beliefs. Dewey was quick to point this out.

> Dr. Childs says "All classifications are tools made for purposes." From the standpoint of current Marxian orthodoxy the position is thoroughly heterodox. For according to the latter the class concept is a strictly realistic apprehension of the existing social reality.[17]

However, a critique of Dr. Childs' Marxism in no way answers his criticisms of experimental method as the controlling idea of a school curriculum. Dewey goes on to debate politics when the appropriate reply to Childs would discuss experimental intelligence and its connection to valuation.

The same issues surfaced nearly two years later with Childs' review of *Progressive Education at the Crossroads* in May of 1938. Using Bode's own phrases, Childs summarizes one of the major steps in the book's argument.

> Actually, "the only way to discover a need is in terms of a 'pattern' or scheme of values or an inclusive philosophy of some kind. "This inclusive educational philosophy must be, in the last analysis, a social philosophy, because an "education theory inevitably becomes a theory of social relationships. ' "It is the lack of an adequate social ideal that has burdened the progressive movement with a heavy load of trivialities and errors. "[18]

Because an educational theory becomes a theory of social relationships Bode looks outside the school to the social world for some empirical definition of social values. He labels the lack of agreement on social ideals as the cause of philosophical disarray among progressive educators instead of questioning the ability of experimental method to deal with experience and valuation as a context for action.

In his critique Childs points out that indoctrination is not the only alternative to the cultivation of pure experimental intelligence in the schools. ". . . (V)alues and beliefs may be inculcated and yet have the status of tools to be used and modified whenever and wherever advance in knowledge and change in life conditions make such adaptation desirable."[19] For Childs "deliberate educational nurture and direction. . . and liberation of individual intelligence are entirely compatible procedures."[20]

Childs completes his criticism of Bode's position in a November 1938 article entitled "Dr. Bode on 'Authentic Democracy'". He questions whether any definition of American democracy contains enough meaning to guide educational activity without taking current economic and political facts into account. "To what extent can 'ends' be divorced from 'means' and still retain significant intellectual and moral meaning?'[21] Childs accuses Bode of holding a formalist position. For Childs, no statement of the meaning of democracy is adequate until it recognizes that economic reconstruction should become one of the controlling ends of current politics and educational practice.

In his final reply, "Dr. Childs and Education for Democracy," Bode is still unable to separate Childs political position from his methodological argument.

> . . . he (Childs) shows a disposition to identify democracy with a campaign for a specific scheme of ownership and distribution. Hand in hand with this goes a bold demand for ' inculcation". . .[22]

Bode calls Childs' distinction between education and education for social action merely a literary distinction but fails to support his accusation. In the end he failed to recognize the importance of Childs' position.

In the course of these historic exchanges John Childs introduced a new challenge to Progressive educational thought; not only must children be taught to define social problems by using experimental method, but they should consciously question the basis of their definitions. He rejected the notion that equating experimental method with the object of definition could suggest a viable path for social reconstruction. Bode was concerned that children learn to work with a certain type of investigation and knowledge. Childs was searching for a methodology to explain how the learner might use experimental intelligence to reach valid definitions and conclusions about existing social problems and apply them to the task of social reconstruction. The philosophical perspective John Childs was searching for continues to be a valid source of progressive criticism of our social institutions. It is essential to understanding and criticizing the workings of schools.

NOTES

[1] John Dewey, "Can Education Share in Social Reconstruction," *The Social Frontier*, October 1934, p. 12.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] John Childs, Review of *Education as Statecraft*, in *The Social Frontier*, November 1934, p. 24.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., p. 25.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid., p. 23.

[9] Boyd Bode, "Education and Social Reconstruction," *The Social Frontier*, January 1935, p. 21.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid., p. 22.

[12] Ibid.

[13] John Childs, "Professor Bode on 'Faith in Intelligence,'" *The Social Frontier*, March 1935, p. 22.

[14] Ibid. p. 23.

[15] Ibid., p. 22.

[16] John Dewey, "Class Struggle and the Democratic Way," *The Social Frontier*, May 1936, p. 241.

[17] Ibid.

[18] John Childs, Review of *Progressive Education at the Crossroads*, The Social Frontier, May 1938, p. 267.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] John Childs, "Dr. Bode on 'Authentic Democracy,'" *The Social Frontier*, November 1938, p. 41.

[22] Boyd Bode, "Dr. Childs and Education for Democracy," *The Social Frontier*, November 1938, p. 39.

THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THEODORE BRAMELD'S "DEFENSIBLE PARTIALITY": A MID-CENTURY 'RESOLUTION" TO THE IMPOSITION CONTROVERSY

Craig Kridel
Teaching Associate
The Ohio State University

> I have never been comfortable in the inner sanctums of pure scholarship for too long a period. The air is not sufficiently saturated with the oxygen of everyday human life. So all the way through my professional years, I have found time both to study philosophy and to relate theory to practice.
>
> Theodore Brameld

As the leading spokesman of reconstructionism in the 1950's and 1960's, the writings of Theodore Brameld offer a "theoretical resolution" to the imposition controversy.

As one follows the articles in the *Social Frontier, Frontiers of Democracy* and *Progressive Education*, undercurrents of a "new" reconstructionism are seen emerging from the writings of Brameld. In 1950 the publication of two of Brameld's books, *Ends & Means in Education* and *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, marked the coming of age of reconstructionism as a distinct philosophy of education.

I will present a theoretical concept, "defensible partiality" which pertains to indoctrination, and show its relation to the educational position of Reconstructionism. To explicate this relationship, I will describe a rather obscure curriculum project conducted by Theodore Brameld, a project in which key theoretical concepts of Reconstructionism [including defensible partiality] were practiced.

This study is warranted in terms of its contribution to the field of curriculum which is in need of many such studies. One critic has observed this need as follows:

> In the mid-1970's, any careful analysis of the field of curriculum theory and practice concluded with generalizations such as: we face a serious condition of "mindlessness" in the schools; the reform movement of the 1960's has left little by way of significant curriculum innovation; the curriculum field is both ahistorical and atheoretical.(1)

Charles Silberman, in *Crisis in the Classroom*, the widely-publicized Carnegie Commission report, summarized the curriculum development efforts in the secondary schools in a way that further demonstrates the lack of adequate base:

> These schools have not addressed themselves to the basic question of educational purpose. Indeed, the changes they have introduced, important and welcomed as they are, sometimes have the effect of avoiding the really hard questions.(2)

When the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education commissioned John Goodlad to examine the field of curriculum development in the 1960's, his report, *Behind Classroom Doors*, was remarkably similar to the Carnegie Study. Concerning innovative curriculum proposals, Goodlad states:

> some of the most highly recommended and publicized innovations of the past decade or so were dimly conceived...the novel features seemed to be blunted in the effort to twist the innovation into familiar conceptual frames or established patterns of schooling.(3)

Although Goodlad and associates concluded that very little significant curricular reform occurred during the late 1950's and 1960's what is important is the report's acknowledgment of the lack of concern for "historical-philosophical foundations of curriculum in the national curriculum reform effort." Herbert Kliebard, in his reappraisal of the Tyler Rationale, further accentuates this point:

> One of the disturbing characteristics of the curriculum field is its lack of historical perspective. New breakthroughs are solemnly proclaimed when in fact they represent minor modifications of early proposals, and conversely, anachronistic dogmas and doctrines maintain a currency and uncritical acceptance far beyond their present merits.(4)

Supporting Kliebard's analysis of the curriculum field as ahistorical, Lawrence Cremin emphasizes the need for educational philosophers to abandon technical philosophical analysis.(5) They should return to their "historic responsibility" of considering the fundamental questions of value, belief, and loyality, which are foundational issues basic to the field of curriculum, he asserts.(6)

In view of this state of the field which demands careful study into both history and theory, a persistent issue arises time and again. It can, perhaps, best be posed as a question: Do teachers have the right to consciously influence the opinions and thoughts of their students? Educational philosopher Theodore Brameld has spoken precisely to this issue. With his commitment to "action-research"(7), he offers the field of curriculum one of the few, if not the only, case examples of a practiced course of study based on reconstructionism theory.

This curriculum experiment, the Floodwood Project, occurred before the formal christening of Reconstructionism. However, Brameld's *Design for America*--the published account of the Floodwood Project and a guide for future curriculum development efforts--is based on implicit and partially articulated Reconstructionist assumptions. These assumptions were later refined into a "formal platform" by the 1950's. In fact, one can easily see the foundations being laid at Floodwood for Brameld's 1960's and 1970's work in anthropology and the refined concept, "anthropotherapy."

The Emergence of Defensible Partiality

As Brameld became more prominent in the field of education during the late 1940's, the controversy and debates between Progressives and those termed Social Reconstructionists had subsided. This allowed Brameld to make the necessary distinction between his philosophy, Reconstructionism, and that of the Social Reconstructionists.

Brameld regarded the adjective "social" as too restrictive. What was attributed to separating Brameld's work from that of such efforts as the University of Illinois Group, and of such individuals as Counts and Childs, was the "dramatically different" nature of the domestic and world situation of the respective times. Greatly influenced by the 1929 Depression, the Social Reconstructionists were primarily concerned with domestic ills and with what ways education might help. Brameld, whose writing followed a "successful" world war and rapidly improving technology in the fields of transportation and communication, acknowledged the "ever-shrinking planet" and saw the community for reconstruction as encompassing the entire world. Man was caught in a "planetary transformation;" post-war planning and reconstruction must be aimed "toward the desperate plight, growing power, and emerging goals of the underdeveloped areas of the world, inhabited by the bulk of the world's population."(8)

Drawing heavily upon Dewey's work, Brameld attempted to present Reconstructionism as a coalescence of progressivism and concern for the "planetary transformation." This synthesis was achieved, in part, by making progressivism appear antiquated, and then by offering Reconstructionism as contemporary, progressive thought. Progressivisim was shown as appropriate for a period of transition [which, according to Brameld, had long been past], resulting in an emphasis upon the "means" and upon the individual. "Experimentalism does not offer a philosophic justification for lack of strong commitment to anything so much as the method itself."(9) Though progressive thought was proper for its age--that being one of industrialism, nationalism, capitalistic democracy, and individualistic liberalism--progressivism was, in Brameld's terms:

> the educational effort of an adolescent culture suffering from the pleasant agonies of growing up, from preoccupation with the excitement of present events, from the cultural period of trying and erring when the protections of infancy have been left behind but the planned autonomies of maturity await future delination and fulfillment.(10)

Brameld's writing was oriented towards a maturing culture, one which could look ahead and plan progress. Such future planning required nothing less than a reconstruction of society, he asserted:

> we must first look for such a new philosophy; for there we shall be most likely to develop methods by which to discover and measure the weaknesses of our present social, economic, and political structure–in short, to know the truth about it. Out of this analysis must then be drawn convincing blueprints of a new social order, adequate enough to eliminate the tragedies of our present system, desirable enough to inspire fervent devotion to it as an achievable ideal, and implemented by a method powerful enough to reach the objective.
>
> To articulate and motivate such a philosophy is today the first task not only of philosophers but of all educators and social scientists whose values lie with democratic progress.(11)

Although Theodore Brameld attempted to distinguish himself from the Social Reconstructionists, he nevertheless needed a defense against the major criticism of their position, a criticism that was at the center of the "indoctrination controversy." Reconstructionist education, states Brameld:

> encourages students, teachers, and all members of the community not merely to *study* knowledge and problems crucial to our period of culture but also *to make up their minds* about the most promising solutions and then to act concertedly. Its emphasis on *commitment* to agree-upon, future-looking goals thus raises the old problem, once more, of bias and indoctrination.(12)

Brameld defines indoctrination as follows:

> It is that method of learning by cummunication that proceeds only in one direction [from the "communicator" to the "communicatee"] and is for the purpose of inculcating in the latter the acceptance of some one doctrine or systematic body of beliefs. Moreover, such doctrine is assumed by its exponents in advance to be so supremely true, so good, or so beautiful as to justify no need for critical, scrupulous, thoroughgoing comparison with alternative doctrines.(13)

In further delineating how his view differs from indoctrination, Brameld asserts:

> by its very nature indoctrination is in sharp contrast with a philosophy that teaches men to build positive convictions only by public inspection and communication of all pertinent and available evidence and by exhaustive consideration of alternative convictions.(14)

From his opposition to indoctrination, Brameld develops a type of "partiality" that is also "defensible." He explains this concept as follows:

> What we learn is defensible simply in so far as the ends we support and the means we utilize are able to stand up against exposure to open, unrestricted criticism and comparison. What we learn is partial in so far as these ends and means still remain definite and positive to their majority advocates after the defense occurs...(15)

One might think "defensible partiality" leads to an "ideological rigidity" or resentment towards the critic, but Brameld puts this concern aside, for, as partiality is sought:

> partiality paradoxically increases in defensibility only as it is tested by the kind of impartiality provided through many sided evidence [unrational as well as rational], unrestricted communication by group learning, complete respect for criticism and minority dissent.(16)

As for the ethics of teachers expressing their "partial beliefs" to students, Brameld states:

> I have never understood why it is less legitimate for, say, a well-educated teacher to hold & express reasoned out convictions, than it is for a scientist to become enthusiastic about a hypothesis he then endeavours to prove true by a due process which, by definition, leaves the door wide open to the contingency that it may prove to be false.(17)

In understanding Brameld's concept of defensible partiality, it is important to note that he views it as a theoretical construct appropriate for teaching adolescents and young adults rather than elementary age children.

Clearly, much more could be said about Reconstructionism and defensible partiality, but a fuller understanding might better be achieved by examining a practical application. This application also takes us into the field of curriculum development and permits us to see some of the historical foundations underpinning that field.

The Floodwood Project

> One morning about a year ago fifty boys and girls, members of the junior and senior classes in a small, fairly typical rural community school at Floodwood, Minnesota, met for discussion with the superintendent of schools, the English teacher, the social studies teacher, and a visiting member of the University of Minnesota faculty. The students were asked whether they would enjoy embarking upon an educational adventure. Instead of studying literature of the past, the institutions and practices of

yesterday and today, why not turn to the future for a change? Why not try to answer the question, "What kind of society do we as young citizens want to build for tomorrow?"(18)

As this excerpt from the *Teachers College Record* indicates, in 1944, Theodore Brameld, Associate Professor of Educational Philosophy at the University of Minnesota, undertook a curriculum project which gave the junior and senior classes at Floodwood High School "the opportunity to build by co-operative thinking and exploration a blueprint of our future society."(19)

Two hours a day, five days a week, for three and one-half months, the fifty-one students and four members of the high school faculty met as a group and engaged in post-war planning, a central focus of the project.

The following *hypothetical* plan was devised by Brameld and associates as a guideline for the Floodwood Project:

1. Motivation and Orientation
    a. Tests on student information and attitudes regarding the future of America and World society.

    b. Discussion of some of the controversial statements in the tests.
    c. Discussion of inconsistencies and confusions in class attitudes and information.
    d. Preparation of community questionnaire to determine what typical citizens think of post-war problems and expectations.
    e. Visitations and oral reports giving to group results of survey.
    f. Study of the "between-the-wars" period [1918-1941]: evidence as to results of inadequate planning for period following World War I; boom and depression; economic, social, political innovations; threat and realization of new wars.
    g. Evaluation of contemporary democracy by a criterion: What do we want from an effective society? Does the present society give us what we want? May democracy be defined as that society which aims to satisfy the maximum of our wants?
    h. Comparison of democracy and fascism. Does fascism satisfy people's wants? Is it likely to supersede democracy? Do fascist attitudes and practices exist within as well as without America?
    i. Preview of weaknesses and strengths in national and international planning in major areas of contemporary life--efforts being made to avoid mistakes of last post-war period.

2. Economics Area
    a. Guiding question: What major changes, if any, are desirable in our economic system in order to assure security, stability, a high standard of living, and democratic participation in its operation?

b. Study of chief proposals of the economic "right" [e.g., big business] for economic life in the post-war period.
c. Chief proposals of the economic "center" [e.g., the National Resources Planning Board].
d. Chief proposals of the economic "left" [e.g., Socialist party].
e. Group agreements and differences on economic proposals.

3. Political Area
   a. Guiding question: What changes, if any, are needed in the structure and machinery of American government in order to meet effectively the standard of democracy we have set up as a group?
   b. Study of chief relationships with economics area.
   c. Significance of civil liberties for a strong democracy.
   d. States' rights vs. federalism.
   e. Regionalism as a socio-political objective.
   f. Other proposals.
   g. Group agreements and differences on political proposals.

4. Art Area
   a. Guiding question: What role can art play in bringing about and fulfilling the democracy we want?
   b. Approach to art as visionary [e.g., Bellamy, Munford].
   c. Artists of democracy [e.g., Whitman, Sandburg, Rivera, Robeson].
   d. Federal subsidization of art.
   e. New Media [e.g., photography].
   f. City and architectural planning.
   g. Other social roles of art.
   h. Group agreements and differences on art proposals.

5. Science Area
   a. Guiding question: What role can science play in bringing about and fulfilling the democracy we want?

   b. What does science already know about reconstructing systems of transportation and communication, city planning, housing, and other aspects of practical living?
   c. Study of health deficiencies of the American people; the pros and cons of propsals for eliminating those deficiencies.
   d. Federal support of science.
   e. The scientist as a socially responsible citizen.
   f. Scientific method and the operation of democracy.
   g. Is abundance feasible?
   h. Other issues and needs.
   i. Group agreements and differences on proposals of science.

6. Education Area
   a. Guiding question: What is the role of education in effecting our design for America?
   b. Study of changes in liberal education and vocational education

recommended by experts.
   - c. Federal support and/or control of the schools.
   - d. Plans for adult education.
   - e. Work experience and education.
   - f. School democracy--how and what?
   - g. Problems of discipline and indoctrination.
   - h. Other issues and needs.
   - i. Group agreements and differences on proposals of education.

7. Human Relations Area
   - a. Guiding question: What changes and improvements, if any, shall we seek in the field of human relations–racial, national, familial, personal?
   - b. Analysis of equality as practical and desirable for Negroes and other minority groups.
   - c. Equality in the home as a practical and desirable objective.
   - d. Other issues and needs.
   - e. Group agreements and differences on proposals in human relations.

8. Summary: Agreements, Disagreements, Recommendations
   - a. Major agreements and disagreements in each area.
   - b. Common denominators of agreement and disagreement between the areas (e.g., economics and politics).
   - c. Recognition of omissions and brief consideration of these.
   - d. Proposals for action: On the basis of agreements reached, what implementations emerge implicitly and explicitly?
   - e. Criticisms of and recommendations for improvement of project.
   - f. Repetition of fact and opinion tests, and comparisons.(20)

At the outset, no detailed outline of the project was presented to the Floodwood group. Instead, it was assumed that as the study progressed, specifics would be formulated co-operatively by the students and teachers.

The participants spent approximately three weeks on the "motivation & orientation area." Pre-tests were administered to the students, and subsequent meetings were devoted to discussion of the meaning and interpretation of typical statements in the tests. The community's values were then assessed via a questionnaire, which was formulated through classroom discussion and meetings with area citizens.

To help students "understand the failures of the first post-war period in planning adequately for the economic and other readjustment necessary," at study of the "between-the-wars" period was undertaken. This led to the cooperative investigation of the meaning of democracy. The group then attempted "to build a definition out of its own experiences and expectations as to what it would suppose a good society should provide." Stuart Chases's *Goals for America* offered an introductory explanation of elementary wants.

From those exploratory experiences, a series of panel discussions and group research led to the identification of a variety of wants that "must be satisfied if society is to fulfill its obligation to the people." By way of voting, the group determined the following as "major wants:" food, shelter, clothing, health, education, religion, family, work, recreation. ("Participation" and "recognition" were later added.)

The following selection from the project report suggests something of the flavor of this process:

> The concluding meetings of the motivation period were devoted to reaching unanimous agreement on the proposition that democracy, by comparison with such dictatorial governments as fascism, was by all odds most likely to satisfy the wants of the majority of the people, inasmuch as it is the only form of society known to contemporary civilization in which the fundamental want of "self-realization" is not denied. A majority agreed also that socialism and communism are in the libertarian stream of political evolution, and hence more allied with than opposed to democracy.
>
> The first major stage of the project was concluded by a public meeting at which students selected by the class illustrated through a panel discussion the methods and conclusions thus far reached. This meeting was attended by fifty to seventy-five citizens and was addressed by the co-operating University instructor.(21)

The project continued with four weeks devoted to the study of economics. Transition to this particular curricular experience is reported by Brameld:

> The economic area was the first chosen for study because of agreement that problems of economic planning are crucial to other problems--that unless America cures such recurrent evils as depressions, with its inevitable unemployment and poverty, there is very little practicality to other areas of reconstruction which depend upon economic security and stability.(22)

This study of economics was followed by a five week period in which the students broke into groups and studied concurrently art, education, human relations, science, and political areas. In these instances, when a group finished its pre-assigned area, it would move to another; covering much the same material that had already been studied by another group. Students spent time in the community, visiting and interviewing residents. Citizens also came into the classroom as resource visitors; this use of the community was a distinctive feature of the project.

There was team teaching among the project's faculty, and during class discussions, the instructors:

> would move from group to group [during the study period] helping with suggestions of materials, answering questions, straightening out differences among the students. The co-operating instructors also, of course, conferred frequently at each stage of the project and modified the procedure and plan as they went along.(23)

A two-week period was alloted to conclude the Project. The following range of experiences characterized this culminating phase: [1] concern for international aspects of the Project's "design for America;" [2] review, synthesis, final agreements and disagreements regarding major proposals; [3] final tests [repetition of those given at outset of project] and comprehensive examinations; [4] evaluations by co-operating staff.

A selection of the major ideological conclusions generated by this curriculum experiment suggests the very essence of the Floodwood Project. These should be viewed in juxtaposition with those previously-stated beliefs of Brameld. For example, the student group "agreed strongly" to the superiority of democracy over fascism, as determined by the number of wants fulfilled. Communism and facism were not viewed as "twin evils;" "a majority of students grasped the conception that socialism and communism belong in the libertarian stream of democratic thought," Brameld reports.(24)

Further, a number of students supported a long-range, national program of public works, though it was agreed that private enterprise "should be given every opportunity to provide as much employment as possible." Specific political reforms favored by the majority of the group were: termination of the poll tax; reapportioning of representation geographically; reform of civil service; reduction of voting age; increased political responsibility by average citizens; public control of pressure groups. It is interesting to note that economic-political reforms receiving most agreement were those not directly affecting the status of the students or their families.

By the end of the project, virtually all of the students agreed that art renders significance for "common people like themselves," even though they had not had any previous experience with art.(25) They came to realize art was "practical" as well as "pure," and that it plays a significant "integral part in the whole of democratic evolution."

Most students favored increased student participation in school government and curriculum. Many supported federal aid to equalize educational opportunity; greatly increased adult education; community participation in school affairs; a "generous" program of education for war veterans; better teacher-training; increased vocational education; "work experience" as a regular part of the school program; and more emphasis on contemporary problems.

The student orientation was extremely "equalitarian" in the human relations area. Students felt there should be equitable treatment toward minorities, especially blacks, and they supported "international as well as intercultural equalitarianism of races and groups."(26)

Interestingly enough, students expressed attitudes sympathetic with the current feminist movement:

> There seemed to be strong support of their [women's] right not only to hold jobs during wartime, but to continue to hold them after the war if they wished. Their only qualification was that women with small children should make sure that protection and care would be amply provided.(27)

In conclusion, an interrelationship of ideas was noticed and "appreciated" by the students. Specifically, there was "the dominant conception of democracy which was developed co-operatively at the outset, and which was utilized repeatedly as a criterion of judgment in the various areas."(28) It is important to note this emphasis on democracy in the total undertaking, for it provides significant evidence we shall later want to examine when relating Brameld's position in the imposition controversy to the philosophical ends-means issue in the larger realm of Progressive thought.

The Floodwood Project Community Setting

The Floodwood Project as an historical curriculum development effort must be viewed in the larger context of its community setting. With many families of Scandinavian descent [predominately Finnish], the Floodwood community was a center of strong consumer and producer cooperatives. Several socialist clubs were organized among the Finns during the 1900's; Socialist halls provided a place for discussions, speakers, and political meetings. Lewis Harris, former Floodwood superintendent of schools, remembers:

> These old socialists would sit around those halls and study, read, and debate; they were really very academic. They weren't too practical--they wouldn't get out and vote; but I was amazed to find the sophistication of some Finn lumberjack talk about economics, labor history, or whatnot.(29)

Located in a community which reflected socialistic attitudes, the Floodwood School system readily embraced Brameld's philosophy of education. Harris, in reflecting on this fact, asserts: "Here was a school raising the types of questions he wanted to raise."(30) Throughout the 1930's and 1940's Floodwood High School was a "community school."(31) Academic studies were directly related to pressing community issues and affairs. For example, an eighth grade science class had made an extensive study of the community's tap water, leading to direct action by the local town council. Other such studies were a part of the ongoing program.

Though Brameld felt Floodwood was far more typical than atypical of a Minnesota community, he noticed the High School's more liberal orientation among the different Minnesota school systems:

> Floodwood High School had already moved farther in the direction of a progressive, community school than most schools in Minnesota. At the same time, it is safe to say that the project did undoubtedly help to strengthen and clarify attitudes already crystallizing toward education.(32)

But there is evidence that Brameld's experiment was not well received by all members of the community. During the war years, several new and returning business men moved into the area, an influx which created a division, and subsequent fight for school board power. Such a struggle had previously occurred during the mid-twenties and thirties between the co-operative farm element–"the coops," and the business element--"the main street."(33)

Growing criticism of the High School's general education program ["too much general and not enough education"] and charges of subversive activity as a result of Brameld's curriculum project, led this new and vocal business-interest group to form the Committee for Better Education.(34) The Committee formally endorsed school board candidates in the spring 1948 elections, but their presence was well felt during Brameld's time. It should be noted that many innovative school programs were under attack at this time. Typical of the attacks at the national level were those launched by Alan Zoll and his National Council for American Education. Undoubtedly this widespread public criticism of education found a target in Floodwood.

Reflections on Floodwood Project

For a different historical perspective on the Floodwood Project, questionnaires were sent to those high school students [Floodwood classes of 1944 and 1945] who participated in the curriculum experiment. With a questionnaire return rate of forty-two percent, the responses offer insight into practiced, defensible partiality.

Most of the returned questionnaires were negative regarding the theory and intention of the experiment ["not worth the effort," "waste of time"]; its organization ["course materials were late to arrive," "interpersonal conflict between participating teaching staff"];

and lack of college-preparatory subjects in the curriculum. With such strong ethnic backgrounds in the community, English was a second language; instruction was necessary for the students to meet college admissions requirements.

Though made thirty-two years later, these remarks were in keeping with those of the Committee for Better Education. But only four respondents stated "yes" when asked, "During the Project were certain beliefs presented in such a way that caused you to prefer one over another?" and "Do you feel you were indoctrinated by the Floodwood Project?" Clearly, the great majority of students did not believe that they had been indoctrinated.

The main thrust of this brief examination of Brameld's early effort to apply his philosophical position to a practical curriculum development project in Floodwood, Minnesota, has been: [1] to explicate his concept of "defensible partiality" as it was practiced, and [2] to relate this undertaking to the larger imposition controversy that divided certain of the Social Reconstructionists into two "camps." This study also serves as an initial effort to generate some of the basic historical-philosophical case material that is so urgently needed in developing an adequate theoretical base for the curriculum field.

What are some of the warranted generalizations that might be drawn from the study? The following seem clearly supportable:

1. Brameld was working within the large Christian-Judiac-Democratic value framework of the Progressives when he tried to translate his Reconstructionism into practical curriculum planning and development. This generalization holds, despite his later efforts to disassociate his position from that of the Social Reconstructionists.

2. Brameld's "defensible partiality" differed markedly from indoctrination as an educational method. In practice, as exemplified in the Floodwood Project, it appears very similar, for example, to Boyd H. Bode's "democracy as a way of life" and to his "school as a laboratory for democracy" when these were translated into school practice.

3. Brameld, as were Childs and Counts, was confused by the ends-means relationships between curriculum planning and instructional strategies. Professor Philip Smith's thesis is supported in this regard.

4. The Floodwood Project, like many current curriculum development efforts, did not adequately involve all of the participants in the undertaking. The time span for the project was limited, and the necessary arrangements for the democratic cooperation Brameld sought were not fully developed. These shortcomings prevailed, despite the fact that the community setting was, for that time, something of a model of participatory democracy.

5. The Floodwood Project was "ahistorical' in the sense that its planning and implementation show very little evidence that Brameld built upon the knowledge base of curriculum development. For example, Brameld makes no reference to the Eight-Year Study, which was conducted by the Progressive Education Association only a few years before his undertaking.

With respect to the concept of "defensible partiality," the overarching generalization which emerges from this study is that such a perception of instruction is not incompatible with the democratic values of what Professor Smith has called the "official position." In effect, this means that the indictment of the concept as indoctrination is unwarranted.

NOTES

[1] Robert V. Bullough, Jr., *Harold B. Alberty and Boyd H. Bode: Pioneers in Curriculum Theory* [unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1976], p. 2.

[2] Charles S. Silberman, *Crisis in Classroom* [New York: Random House, 1970], p. 349.

[3] John I. Goodlad, et al., *Behind the Classroom Door* [Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1970], p. 72.

[4] Herbert M. Kliebard, "Reappraisal: The Tyler Rationale," in *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists*, ed. by William Pinar [Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1975], p. 70.

[5] Lawrence A. Cremin, "Curriculum Making in the United States," in *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists*, ed. Pinar, pp. 19-35.

[6] Ibid., p. 33.

[7] Theodore Brameld, *The Remaking of a Culture* [New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1959].

[8] Theodore Brameld, *Education for the Emerging Age* [New York: Harper & Borthers Publishers, 1961], p. 15.

[9] Theodore Brameld, *Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective* [Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955], p. 183.

[10] Theodore Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy* [New York: World Book Co., 1950], p. 204.

[11] Theodore Brameld, "Metaphysics and Social Attitudes," *The Social Frontier*, Vol. 4, No. 35, May, 1938, p. 258.

[12] Theodore Brameld, *Ends and Means in Education: A Midcentury Appraisal* [New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950], p. 86.

[13] Ibid., p. 88.

[14] Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, p. 563.

[15] Brameld, *Ends and Means in Education: A Midcentury Appraisal* p. 92.

[16] Ibid., p. 93.

[17] Theodore Brameld, "Reconstructionist Theory: Some Recent Critiques Considered in Perspective," *Educational Theory* Vol. XVI, No. 4, October, 1966, p. 338.

[18] R. B. Raup, B. O. Smith, "High School Students Work on 'A Design for America,'" *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 46, No. 4, January, 1945, pp. 250-255.

[19] Theodore Brameld, *Design for America* [New York: Hinds, Hayden & Eldredge, Inc., 1945], p. 3.

[20] Ibid., pp. 3-6.

[21] Ibid., p. 22.

[22] Ibid., p. 39.

[23] Ibid., pp. 8-9.

[24] Ibid., p. 105.

[25] Ibid., p. 107.

[26] Ibid., p. 108.

[27] Ibid., p. 108.

[28] Ibid., p. 109.

[29] Lewis E. Harris, personal interview, August 6, 1976, Dublin, Ohio.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Lewis E. Harris, *A Study of Certain Factors in the Evolution and Development of the Floodwood Community School* [unpublished Doctoral dissertation, New York: New York University, 1952].

[32] Harris, personal interview, August 6, 1976.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Harris, *A Study of Certain Factors in the Evolution and Development of the Floodwood Community School*, p. 212.

THE POLITICS OF VALUES

P. L. Smith
The Ohio State University

The period of the 1930's was one of extreme turbulence in American life. Capitalism seemed to be impotent in the face of massive economic collapse. Even democracy was being challenged. It looked to many as if personal freedom was incompatible with the demands of equality. The realities of the twentieth century were forcing the American tradition of liberty to give way to group conceptions of human rights and responsibilities. Matters appeared even worse with the loss of faith in reform. The 1920's had shown the futility of the earlier progressive movement and revealed liberalism as an ally of the status quo. For those who rejected the established order and wished to hasten its passing radical action was the only acceptable response.[1]

Such was the atmosphere in which the founders of progressive education were forced to confront a long-standing anomaly in their thought. Can virtue be taught, or must it somehow be imposed? Progressive educational thinkers were never clear or consistent in trying to answer this question. On the one hand, they recognized that values were important and that education must foster the good, but, on the other hand, they did not think that it was ever wise to force others to accept a particular value orientation.

The Normative Thrust of Progressive Education

More precisely, the founders of progressive education revered democracy as a way of life and saw deliberate education as the most effective means for transmitting democratic values in an urban industrial society. When asked why they so revered democracy as a way of life progressive thinkers had a ready answer. They believed that it supplied the necessary and sufficient conditions for scientific intelligence, or, put in negative terms, for non-formalist thinking. And what was the value of non-formalist thinking? Progressives believed it was two-fold, both instrumental and intrinsic. It was instrumental in solving practical problems and thereby contributing to human survival. It was intrinsic in contributing to human welfare and improving the quality of life. This belief in the inherent value of scientific intelligence is rarely understood or appreciated by the critics of progressive education. But those who conceived the movement were convinced that the ultimate value in non-formalist thinking and, thus, in democracy itself, as a way of life, was found in the fact that it created and developed the capacities to think and to experience human emotions. Without these capacities human beings are essentially the same as other living things. But with them, they are unique; they possess the necessary tools for deliberately converting the hostile forces of nature to human advantage. And of even greater significance, these powers of mind have intrinsic value because they provide the source of human culture and the foundations of human dignity. Progressive thinkers were humanists by inclination and naturalists *by philosophy. Given* their convictions and their belief that the realization of human mental potential was tied to democratic living by empirical necessity, it is easy to understand the normative thrust of progressive education.

However, accompanying this thrust was an abhorrence of indoctrination. Regardless of motivation progressive thinkers eschewed all forms of imposition. Here too they had a reason. Indoctrination or imposition was seen as contrary to democracy. In so being it stifled the growth of scientific intelligence. And this, in turn, had the dual effect of decreasing the chances of survival and detracting from the quality of life. By itself the rejection of indoctrination or imposition in the educational enterprise of schooling may not seem incompatible with the acceptance of a normative thrust in schooling. But there was a kicker in this mix.

Progressive educational thinkers rejected the Aristotelian idea of development from within. They were unanimous in the belief that the cultivation of human nature was not enough. On the progressive view human nature is virtually created by natural forces, and if it is to be created intelligently, it must be understood and controlled by the only source of intelligence there is, man himself. But if there is no guarantee, if, indeed, it is unlikely, that human beings will develop in desirable ways without human control of the process of development, and if the individual or individuals being educated cannot be expected to possess the capacities to understand or control this process, at least at the start, as virtually everyone, including progressive thinkers, will admit, how in the world can indoctrination or imposition be avoided; assuming, of course, we should all develop in desirable ways?

Progressive Education in the Limelight

The failure of progressive education to provide a clear and decisive answer to this question represents a serious soft-spot in its theoretical posture. So long as progressives were on the offensive, attacking the enemy, "traditional education" or "formalist educational thinking," this soft-spot was hard to detect, and was easy to avoid even when recognized. Supporters believed that the opposition had a strong ideological hold on public thinking, and that this hold had to be broken before the progressive alternative could be completely spelled out. But by the 1920's the victory was pretty much won. Traditional education was in considerable disrepute, at least theoretically. The immediate effect was to produce an intellectual vacuum. Theoretical issues were simply not seen as important. People were intellectually free to think pretty much what they liked. So long as they were doing something and claimed guidance from some rationale, they were effectively left alone to function as their own philosophical critics.

But the press of events soon brought this period to an end. And the 1930's were to change the role of the progressive tradition in American life. Eyes were no longer solely on the opposition. There were real and serious problems to be faced, problems that threatened the welfare of everyone. If what had been accepted theretofore could not provide solutions to these problems, people were ready to consider alternatives. The mood was at least congenial to the practical examination of new ideas. Where old ways would not work, new ways would be encouraged. What could be better for the type of education that was founded on the philosophy of experimentalism?

But with this newfound status came critical examination, and, more specifically, self-examination by proponents who were at least put on the spot to produce on their promise. If their theory of education was to be finally accepted, it would have to meet the test, theoretically as well as practically, supplied by the realities of the depression. Progressive education was finally on the hot seat. If it had weaknesses, they would soon be apparent. And once apparent they could not be ignored. Progressive educational thinkers began to polish up their idea in order to present a defensible, unified and effective front to a beleaguered and eager, but still demanding, public.

The Official View on Imposition

The progressives were soon to discover that on the question of imposition they could not present the type of front they desired. Indeed, there arose a controversy that revealed the aforementioned soft-spot or anomaly in their thinking. There was, it should be said, an "official position" on this issue, but it could hardly be described as acceptable to everyone, or even acceptable to the majority of those who shaped opinion in progressive education.

The official view was the one given by John Dewey and supported so admirably by Boyd H. Bode and William H. Kilpatrick. Dewey claimed that education need never rely on imposition, even when concerned with life's basic orientation. He agreed that education must work to transmit the values of democracy, and must thereby foster particular dispositions about and towards reality, but he insisted, nonetheless, that school learning could be purely experimental. Teachers could avoid indoctrination and still be effective.

Indeed, indoctrination was seen as an obstacle to effective schooling in a democratic society. In a democratic society effective schooling provides a democratic orientation to life. Indoctrination either fails to give any orientation at all, or else brings about an orientation that is inherently undemocratic. According to this official view, a democratic orientation to life can only be provided by means that are themselves democratic. Indoctrination was believed to be anti-democratic. It was said to hinder personal development and destroy the roots of genuine community. With this position, there was virtually no hope that schooling under indoctrination could effectively foster understanding and acceptance of democratic dispositions.

143

Why were supporters of this official view so adamant in relating educational means to educational ends? The answer is not hard to find, although it is amazing how few have found it. In the first place, they justified a democratic orientation because it contributed to mental development. If in the process of acquiring a democratic conception of reality there was no advancement of mental capacities, as there surely would not be under conditions of indoctrination, then supporters of the official view would have been less enthusiastic about democracy as a way of life. But in the second place, and more importantly, they did not believe that a democratic orientation could be acquired save through intelligence. Democratic dispositions were said to be founded on intelligent self-selection. While they may contribute to mental development, they also presuppose intelligence in both their understanding and acceptance. With a democratic or orientation we can foster mental growth; but only by reaching a certain point in mental development can we acquire a democratic orientation.

Dissenters from the official view saw this position as paradoxical. But supporters would say that it only appears paradoxical if we assume that things exist prior to relations, that is, only if we presuppose that intelligence and a democratic orientation must exist independently and before they are interconnected. But in fact, supporters would say, this is simply not so. Both come about as a result of an evolutionary process wherein the reality and character of each is a result of its transactions with the other. Here, democratic values and mental capacities are assumed to be mutually dependent. Each is a necessary condition for the other. As we become more intelligent we are made increasingly aware of democracy as a way of life, and as we come to see democracy as a way of life, we are, by that very fact, made more intelligent. Each is instrumental for the other as well as being an end in itself. A democratic orientation creates an atmosphere essential for mental growth. But mental growth must attain a minimum plateau before a democratic orientation can be had.

Dewey was not at all bothered by this apparent conflict. He saw the process of transmitting a democratic orientation as necessarily rational. In being rational it fosters mental growth. A person is required to engage in practical action, that is, action with a practical purpose, and to undergo the consequences of his own behavior. Experiences are to be more or less unbridled. Imposition or indoctrination of any sort was seen as a retarding agent. Indeed, it was in great measure because of its reliance on the authority of the teacher that progressives were opposed to traditional forms of schooling. Imposition and indoctrination stifled educational aims. They suppressed mental potential and made it impossible to foster democracy as a way of life. Progressives holding the official view were surely not going to allow it in their own educational scheme.

The Dissenting View on Imposition

Other progressives saw it differently, however. They believed the official view was mistaken for the same reasons liberalism in politics was mistaken. It assumed that rationality could be a fundamental force in the world, that progress was directed by the human mind step by step, and that the advancement of individual and social welfare was gradual and required no quantum leap of faith.

Having been thoroughly radicalized by the 1930's, progressives who criticized the official view simply did not believe that the recognition of goodness, or what was most desirable, was a process that was characterized by rationality. And later in the decade, when they witnessed the rise of fascism, they had further confirmation they were right. There were limits on rationality in the educational enterprise of schooling. Dissenters concluded from this that the normative thrust of the progressive's educational plan cannot always rely on intelligence. In order to achieve his aim the progressive teacher must sometimes employ tactics that are not themselves congenial to rational student choice.

Progressives like George S. Counts and John L. Childs saw the process of understanding and accepting an orientation to life, including a democratic orientation, as requiring something like religious insight. And when the process represented a change from one orientation to another, it required something like religious conversion. But in neither case is intelligence enough by itself. Basic democratic truths, like basic truths generally, can only be seen through faith, at least in the beginning.

Take the propositions that define the democratic outlook. We say, for example, that people are politically equal, that every adult person should have one, but only one vote. And we say this because, among other things, we believe people are equal morally as well, and that the political realm is one wherein moral considerations must bear. Counts and Childs saw these beliefs as much like church dogma. They were true, and every democrat could see why they were true, but they could not be demonstrated or empirically established as formal arguments or scientific judgments, especially to the young or the immature. To be committed to them morally and emotionally, even to understand them intellectually, we must somehow transcend rationality. While it may in fact be rational to accept a democratic orientation and to reject any orientation that is not, the acquisition of democratic dispositions is a complicated extra-rational affair, it is rarely itself rational. The pedagogical distinction between what we accept rationally and what is rational to accept is the same as the distinction some say in part of the philosophy of science, the distinction between the context of discovery and the context of verification. Once we see that a proposition is true or false, we can set about to formulate a rational demonstration. But the recognition or insight itself cannot be explained in procedural or rational terms.

The progressives who dissented from the official view believed that the problem of education was to get students to understand and accept democracy as a way of life, and that this was a process of discovery which went beyond the bounds of intelligence. They valued rationality and thought it important for education to foster mental capacities, but they believed rationality would be valued and mental capacities would be fostered after a democratic orientation was established, not before. Acquisition of the orientation, they said, did not require rationality, and indeed, was sometimes hindered by an over emphasis on reflection and choice. How, then, was education to fulfill its normative thrust? Through imposition, of course. That is, by a process that recognized the complicated extrarational factors that bear on our conceptions of reality and our acceptance of basic values.

The Controversy as a Bogus Dispute

Progressive educational thinkers never fully resolved this dispute. And it remains something of a soft-spot in their theoretical posture. Must it remain a soft-spot forever? I, for one, do not think so. In the first place, it looks to me as if the dispute was more apparent than real. Those who supported and dissented from the official view can easily be seen as talking past one another. And if they were, they might well have been in agreement and not know it. In the second place, the official view rests on a naturalistic conception of value, such that the official view is correct if and only if this conception is sound. The theoretical posture of progressive education can be freed from vagueness and contradiction so long as its conception of value can be presented as a clear and defensible philosophical doctrine.

On the first point, could we not say that neither party to the dispute fully understood the other? Moreover, might we not account for this failure by the fact that the contending sides did not fully understand their own position, or at least were unable to enunciate it clearly? But, of course, we cannot say either of these things unless we know what it was each side meant to say. From our present vantage point, however, it seems rather obvious. However difficult it was to formulate or express their ideas in the original situation it looks now as if one side to the dispute, those holding the dissenting view, wished to discuss *what* we should teach and the other side, those who advanced the official position, wanted to talk about *how* we should teach. In most cases the two concerns are quite distinct, although, admittedly, the more one pushes at their differences the harder it is to tell them apart. We all know, for example, that the way we teach affects what we teach; our instructional techniques have consequences too. By teaching in a certain way we may foster attitudes like tolerance or intolerance, and these are surely legitimate curriculum concerns.

Unquestionably, it was because progressive educational thinkers were reluctant to make a separation between curriculum and instruction that the parties to the imposition controversy continually talked past one another and failed to formulate their particular views in a clear and decisive manner. In refusing to make the distinction absolute, they were making a conceptual point that was far in advance of the thinking in their times. But in sometimes acting as if the distinction could never be made, they fell victim to an internal dispute that cost them dearly in public support. They were unable to present a unified front. Instead of an intellectual perspective that could be linked to educational practice, people saw the extremes of emotional slogans like those they associated with political confrontation.

For this reason it is unfortunate that progressives seem never to admit a distinction between the ideas of curriculum and instruction. Although it may always be relative, it is still quite clear within its limits. What we teach is one thing, how we teach is quite another. We might explain the imposition controversy as an unsuccessful effort to deal with both concerns at once. Dewey and other supporters of the official view usually understood imposition, and always understood indoctrination, as having to do with how we should teach, with instruction or manner of instruction. Dissenters from the official view, like Counts and Childs, understood these ideas in terms of what we should teach, with curriculum, or the aims of education.

Supporters of the official view would sometimes make a distinction between imposition and indoctrination. They would define imposition as the normative thrust of education and indoctrination as a strategy, albeit ineffective, one might employ to realize this thrust. Thus, they would admit that the former was unavoidable and consider it desirable when conceived as a curriculum theory aiming to provide a democratic orientation, and they would repudiate the latter as a scientifically unsound and morally undesirable theory of instruction. As a theory of instruction they would say that it cannot transmit a democratic orientation, and, furthermore, that it retards mental growth.

On this analysis Counts was right to say that imposition was unavoidable, but wrong to conclude that the choice of what to impose is the only educational choice to be made. For the conditions of imposition, or how we impose, makes all the difference in the world. Whether it be restricted or generous, authoritarian or free, whether facts and values be instilled dogmatically or explained and submitted to the independent judgment of students makes the difference between what is and is not taught.[2] This is not to deny that it is often hard to distinguish in practice between what and how we impose, and thus to separate the ends of curriculum from the means of instruction. But still there is a distinction at work here. And the occasional reluctance of some progressive educational thinkers to equate imposition with indoctrination was a recognition this distinction must be made.

Nonetheless, it is true that supporters of the official view generally saw this distinction as Counts saw it, i.e., as a distinction without a difference. Progressives were easy to convince that the point at issue lacked practical significance and was, therefore, unworthy of intellectual support. We can see this reluctance to separate ends from means, curriculum from instruction, as a source of confusion in progressive education. And as a source of confusion it can be seen as an explanation of the imposition controversy. This is not to say that the parties to the imposition controversy were insensitive or unsympathetic to each other's concerns. It is simply to say that the official view on imposition was a view of instruction, and that the dissenting view on imposition was a view of curriculum; and that the means-ends doctrine subscribed to by both parties made it difficult to specify their respective concerns. The confusion that came about made it hard for the two sides in the dispute to communicate clearly, or, for that matter, for each side to fully understand its own position.

We need to be clear here ourselves. This is not to say that there is anything wrong with the means-ends-doctrine in progressive thought. Undoubtedly, it is one of the most, if not the most, significant philosophical insight of our times. But the doctrine only claims that the separation of means and ends is relative and not absolute. It does not deny the distinction itself. Participants in the imposition controversy seemed often to forget the difference between a relative distinction and no distinction at all. But is it not obvious from what we know of their work as a whole that these progressive educational thinkers held to a distinction between curriculum and instruction, albeit a relative one? To insist they wanted to abolish the distinction altogether simply does not make sense. To say, as the progressives did, that decisions of the one sort affect decisions of the other sort, or even that decisions of the one type might entail decisions of the other type, is not to assume that the decisions are one.

The imposition controversy was by and large a bogus dispute. Those who argued for the official view did not mean to imply that teachers should be neutral on critical questions of the day. They recognized that neutrality would deny the normative thrust of progressive education. Surely no one could show they were indifferent towards the inculcation of values, or lacked a commitment to the promotion of a democratic orientation through formal education. It may well be that they saw a democratic orientation, like happiness, as best achieved if not directly pursued. And in this there might have been a genuine difference with their critics. Their critics wanted to do the good by the most direct means. They proceeded immediately to teach democracy and hoped to foster mental capacities indirectly as a by-product of democratic living. But with the official view there was a tendency to begin by fostering mental capacities and then to teach democracy, or even to let democracy teach itself as a result of exercising intelligence. It was as if supporters of the official view believed that doing well, or achieving excellence or perfection in conduct or in practical actions was a more worthy goal than doing the good, at least as a proximate objective. Doing well, or doing a good job, as opposed to doing the good, seemed to be held out as a more reliable guide for achieving moral perfection than that supplied by the motive to do what was morally right.[3] But this emphasis on mental capacities does not deny the acceptance of a democratic orientation as a moral ideal. It only indicates the strategy adopted by those who accepted the official position. One is no less committed to democracy as a way of life simply because he believes it is most likely to become a reality if pursued by a roundabout route.

Correspondingly, dissenters from the official view did not want to claim that education was merely a process of shaping beliefs or conditioning behavior. They accepted restrictions on manner of teaching. The normative thrust of education must employ moral means. Although they emphasized teaching a democratic orientation over the development of mental capacities, they accepted the latter as a goal of equal prominence, at least. Their emphasis, too, was one of strategy, not moral priority. They simply did not believe that education could realize mental potential in a decadent society, and that education for a democracy must temporarily precede individual development. But they never meant this to be interpreted as a lack of respect for personal integrity. After all, they accepted the means-ends doctrine too. They acknowledged the intrinsic value of mental life, and knew the manner by which it was fostered could never be ignored altogether. And they agreed with supporters of the official view that in order to be justified a democratic orientation to life must have instrumental as well as intrinsic value. And, furthermore, they believed that in a just society we must all be able to satisfy our spiritual as well as our material needs. By maintaining this belief they recognized that the quality of life was as important as life itself. They, as well as supporters of the official view, wanted to foster intelligence. And why was intelligence valued? Not simply because it provided the mechanism for self-direction and control, but because it was a source of enjoyment as well. In the end both sides to the imposition controversy accepted the same educational goal--to free the mind from the forces of nature that created it.

The Commitment to Ethical Naturalism

There is one last matter to discuss. In many respects it represents the most important issue of all. Undoubtedly, it deserves considerable attention, more than we will give it here. Still, enough can be said in brief to illustrate the essential point. On its face it is simple enough. Even if the imposition controversy was more apparent than real, it did demonstrate the commitment of progressive educational thought to ethical naturalism and to the theory of value inherent in ethical naturalism.

Dewey and the supporters of the official view were quite clear on this. They argued that values were objective natural properties and that they could only be known through the intelligent analysis of experience, that is, through reason and empirical investigation. This bears on education in a most crucial manner. For it implies literally that students cannot acquire and/or understand a democratic orientation to life unless they engage in practical action and reflect on their resultant experiences. At times dissenters from the official view did not seem to recognize this requirement. Where they expressly repudiated it, the only explanation can be that they failed to recognize, or would not accept, the theory of value which underlies ethical naturalism and defines its basic tenets. They sometimes, perhaps inadvertantly, took a subjectivist's position. They would say, in effect, that values have no referents at all, that they are a creation of the human will or a function of perception. At other times they would presuppose the first tenet of ethical naturalism, that values are objective natural properties, but deny the second, that they can only be known through the intelligent analysis of experience.

In either case, however, imposition is essential, not only in regards to curriculum, but in regards to instruction as well. Since values are defined as having no source, no referents, other than human will, there is no role for intelligence to play in their detection of justification. They are arbitrary, and if the educator wants to transmit them to students, he must use the means of imposition. Where subjectivity reigns, intelligence has no place. The teaching of subjective reality requires non-rational means of instruction.

Even if subjectivity is denied, even if the first tenet which underlies ethical naturalism is assumed, non-rational means of instruction must still be employed so long as the second tenet is not also accepted. For even if we assume that values are objective natural properties, we severely limit, or even exclude, the role of intelligence in their acquisition if we deny the capacity of the individual to know them through practical action and reflection on resultant experiences. It is necessary to use imposition as the means of education whenever and wherever we wish to teach something to someone who, for any reason whatsoever, cannot grasp or understand what we want to teach through the exercise of intelligence. Values that cannot be understood through intelligence would be like concepts, postulates or axioms that the student was not mature enough to understand. If they are to be taught, they must be imposed by non-rational means and only later, perhaps, be seen by the student as rational or necessary.

On this point the official view on imposition, and any view implied by it, can only be correct if the theory of value which underlies ethical naturalism is a sound philosophical doctrine. Otherwise the view supporting imposition as a theory of instruction as well as a theory of curriculum would represent a necessary condition for effective teaching. But if the theory of value which underlies ethical naturalism was unsound, it would do more than undermine progressive education. It would pretty much discredit progressive thought generally, because progressive thought itself is based on this theory of value. Progressive education would be inherently defective because progressive educational theory would be inherently defective. And progressive educational theory would be inherently defective because the philosophy on which it was based would presuppose a false conception of value. On the other hand, if this conception of value was sound, progressive education would receive, perhaps, its strongest support.

Suppose we were to look at the imposition controversy as a dispute over the means of education. In fact it was not, but it could have been. And if it had been, it would have represented a genuine and profound disagreement. The controversy would have have been limited to educational or political differences, but would have included a philosophical dispute over the ontological and epistemological features of values. Whether the official view, or any view implied by it, could have won out would have been contingent on the merits of pragmatism itself. Without being fully aware of it dissenters from the official view issued a challenge to the whole of the progressive movement. During this century ethical naturalism has been constantly on the defensive. If present-day dissidents of the progressive tradition are to reclaim the belief that values generally, and moral values in particular, are best conceived empirically and most readily acquired through experience and intelligent action, they would be well advised to begin by considering the imposition controversy as a possible dispute over the means to be used in schooling. If they can show that progressive education brings out the best in people without relying on imposition, they will reestablish, and not just reaffirm, the faith of their intellectual ancestors.

NOTES

[1] Richard H. Pells, *Radical Visions and American Dreams*. New York: Harper and Row, 1973, pp. 1-95.

[2] Israel Scheffler, *The Language of Education*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publishing Co., 1968 printing, p. 99.

[3] This distinction is, of course, an old one, dating back at least to the time of Aristotle. But its application and force in this context was made apparent to me by my friend and colleague John B Hough; but here again, only after considerable effort on his part. Perhaps, the same could be said of the distinction between curriculum and instruction itself.

PART IV
PROCEEDINGS

The 1976 Meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society

Friday and Saturday
October 29-30

Loyola University of Chicago, Regis Room
Marquette Center
820 North Rush Street
Chicago, Illinois

Afternoon Session Friday, October 29, 1976

1:30- 2:30 p.m. – Registration, Coffee

2:30- 5:00 p.m. – Afternoon Session

Presiding: B. Edward McClellan
Indiana University
Vice-President and Program
Chairperson, MHES

Topic: Moral and Religious Education

Speaker: Patricia T Rooke
University of Alberta

"Tales for the Evangelical Nursery – Calculated to Edify, Caution, Instruct, Alarm, and Improve."

Speaker: Richard Ognibene
Siena College

"Protestant Views on Education, 1865-1900: A Reevaluation of the 'Dual Patterns of Parallel Institutions' Thesis"

Speaker: Helen A. Archibald
Emory and Henry College

"The Philosophy of the Religious Education Association, 1903"

Evening Session Friday, October 29, 1976

5:00 p.m. – Cocktails

6:00 p.m. – Dinner

7:00- 9:00 p.m. – After Dinner Presentations

Presiding:	Rosemary V. Donatelli Loyola University President, MHES
Topic:	New Perspectives on the History of Black Education
Speaker:	James D. Anderson University of Illinois, Urbana "Industrial Philanthropy and Black Higher Education, 1915-1930"
Speaker:	Vincent P. Franklin University of Illinois, Urbana "In Pursuit of Freedom: The Educational Activities of Black Social Organizations in Philadelphia, 1900-1930."

Morning Session Saturday, October 30, 1976

9:00-11:00 a.m. – Morning Session

11:00-12:00 a.m. – Business Meeting, Election of Officers, etc.

Presiding:	Peter DeBoer Calvin College Secretary, MHES
Topic:	Reconstructionism and the Imposition Controversy of the 1930's and 1940's

Panelists:

Gerald L. Gutek, Loyola University (Chairperson) – "George S. Counts as an Ideologist of American Education: The 1930's

*George Dixon, The Ohio State University – "George Counts and the Imposition Controversy"

*James DiGiambattista, The Ohio State University – "The Bode-Childs Imposition Controversy"

*Craig Kridel, The Ohio State University – "The Theory and Practice of Theodore Brameld's 'Defensible Partiality': A Mid-Century Resolution to the Imposition Controversy'

*P. L. Smith, The Ohio State University – "The Politics of Values: A Commentary on Progressive Education"

*These panelists will distribute their papers in advance and offer brief summary remarks at the session itself. Ample time will be reserved for general discussion of the topic.

11:00-12:00 a.m. – Business Meeting

Presiding: Rosemary V. Donatelli
President, MHES

MINUTES

BUSINESS MEETING OF THE MHES, October 30, 1976
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO 11:00 a.m.

I. The meeting was called to order by President Rosemary Donatelli. She commented on the excellent attendance at this year's meetings (50 to 60 in attendance at the Friday meetings; 30 to 40 at the Saturday meetings) and urged the new members to continue coming.

II. Secretary Peter DeBoer read the minutes of the previous meeting. The minutes were approved.

III. The Nominating Committee presented the following slate of officers for the new year:

Edward McClellan – for President
Peter DeBoer – for Vice-President and Program Chairman
William Eaton – for Secretary

A unanimous ballot was moved, cast, and passed.

IV. A motion was passed to meet, in 1977, at Loyola University on October 28 and 29. Appreciation was expressed to Loyola, and especially to Rosemary Donatelli, for hosting the meetings.

V. President Donatelli then explained that in 1978 the national History of Education Society would like to hold its annual meeting in conjunction with the regional Midwest History of Education Society. She also informed us that President Clarence Karier had suggested that the University of Illinois was willing, in 1978, to host that combined meeting.

A motion was made to leave the matter of determining time and site for the 1978 meeting to the officers of MHES to negotiate with Karier and the national Society. Discussion of the motion elicited strong feelings that the joint meeting be kept at Chicago, at Loyola, at the usual time.

The motion passed.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter P. DeBoer
Secretary

MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

Directory of Attendance 1976

David Adams – Cleveland State University
P. David Allen – Indiana University
James D. Anderson – University of Illinois
Helen A. Archibald – Emory and Henry College
Dr. and Mrs. Robert N. Barger – University of Illinois
Robert E. Belding – University of Iowa
Henry Beversluis – Calvin College
Ladtongbai Bhuapirom – Loyola University of Chicago
Rosemarie Bogal – Loyola University of Chicago
Stephen E. Bower – Indiana University
Margaret Clonan – University of Iowa
Stephen M. Colby – Loyola University of Chicago
Peter DeBoer – Calvin College
James DeGiambattista – Ohio State University
George Dixon – Ohio State University
Rosemary Donatelli – Loyola University of Chicago
Walter H. Drost – Wisconsin Lutheran College
Vincent P. Franklin – University of Illinois
William Eaton – Southern Illinois University
Doris Freese – Loyola University of Chicago
Carl H. Gross – Michigan State University
Gerald L. Gutek – Loyola University of Chicago
Robert Heim – University of Iowa
Kay H. Kamin – Rosary College
Clarence J. Karier – University of Illinois
Paul Klohr – Ohio State University
Craig Kridel – Ohio State University
Fr. W. P. Krolikowski – Loyola University of Chicago
Dr. and Mrs. Mark M. Krug – University of Chicago
Patricia Kurriger – College of DuPage
Lyle J. Kurth – Concordia Teachers College
Michael Lee – Chicago State University
Timothy Leonard – St. Xavier College
Neil Lloyd – Loyola University of Chicago
Gregory Lowery – Indiana University
David MacLeod – Central Michigan University
Edward McClellan – Indiana University
Jim Merritt – Northern Illinois University
John R. Mook – Wisconsin State University
J. D. Moore – Michigan State University
W. L. Moore – University of Wisconsin
Dick Ognibene – Siena College
Michael Oliker – Loyola University of Chicago
Eben O. Palmquist – Loyola University of Chicago
Asirvatham Periaswamy – Loyola University of Chicago
Adelia M. Peters – Bowling Green State University
Spiros Rasis – University of Illinois
William C. Rietschel – Loyola University

David B. Ripley – Northern Illinois University
Patricia T. Rooke – University of Alberta
Edward Rutkowski – University of Northern Iowa
Abdul Samad – Southern Illinois University
Charles E. Samec – Morton West High School
W. Richard Stephens – Greenville College
P. L. Smith – Ohio State University
Charles H. Tinit – Indiana University
Roger Vernon – Chicago Board of Education
Donald R. Warren – University of Illinois
Bill Weaver – Indiana University
Harold Wechsler – University of Chicago